

THE
PROSPECTIVE REVIEW.

No. XXXIII.

ART. I.—THE PROPHETS AND KINGS OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT.

The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament. A Series of Discourses preached in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn. By Frederick Denison Maurice. 1853.

THIS book is strongly marked with the usual characteristics of Mr. Maurice's writings, though less we think in it, than in any of his former publications, are the eminent qualities of his mind encumbered by the weaknesses that grow out of his position. We are less painfully struck by the inconsistencies between the theology that is native to his mind, and the theology that accidentally has become dear and hallowed to him, between the theology of freedom and the theology of authority. He approaches the Prophets more as an historian than as a theologian, and seeks only to see with their eyes into the spirit of their times, that from their vivid view of the presence and action of God in human affairs he may give reality to English religion, and make God a living God to the men of his own day. For this is the high aim that pervades and directs all Mr. Maurice's religious writings. He always comes to the Scriptures in a spirit of intense realism, that in their manifestations of man and God he may find divine types of permanent human relationships. The boldness, the earnestness and freedom, with which this is done is often afterwards embarrassed by attempts to bring these

CHRISTIAN TEACHER.—No. 59.

B

universal lessons into harmony with the Church theory of the Bible; and here it is sometimes impossible to escape the painful feeling that he uses his great power of illustration, his readiness in producing analogies between the natural and the supernatural, to hide or evade a difficulty. Thus it is impossible to be certain whether or not he believes Saul to have been under the power of any supernatural inspiration—for the assumption that he is so, which pervades all his treatment of his history, is quietly put by by a side stroke in the following passage,—a passage of the richest truth and beauty:—

“There are moments, you may all have noticed them, in the mind of the dullest and most prosaic man, when unknown springs seem to be opened in him, when either some new and powerful affection, or quite as often the sense of a vocation, fills him with thoughts and causes him to utter words which are quite alien from his ordinary habits, and yet which you are sure he cannot have been taught by any other person—they have in them such a pledge and savour of originality. You say involuntarily, ‘He seemed for the moment quite inspired, he became another man.’ Are you not also half inclined to say, ‘Now, for the first time, *the* man has come forth? Hitherto a cold barren nature, or a formal education, has choked up the life that was in him; now it is bursting through artificial dams, through mud barriers. Now we can see what is in him.’ Soon perhaps he sinks back into what he was before. There are no more traces of that splendour than of a sunset after the shades of night have closed in; but it has been; it has brought something to light which you could never have dreamed of but for that momentary appearance; you feel as if you had a right to think of the man, to measure his capacity, by that which spake forth in him at that instant more than by all the rest of his existence.”

In the same way he speaks as if the Wisdom of Solomon was naturally derived, and then saves his credit by declaring all wisdom to be supernatural.

“But was not Solomon’s wisdom supernatural? Are we justified in using language to describe it which connects it with that of the ordinary king and student? I use the Bible language. Throughout the Book of Proverbs you will find Solomon speaking of that which belongs not to himself, but to every ruler of a land, to every teacher of God’s secrets. He assumes all wisdom to be supernatural; to be supernatural not because it comes in sudden gusts, in some oracular afflatus, but in proportion as it is toilsome, self-

distrusting, open to correction, ready to receive hints and illumination from any source. No subject is too mean for it to be exercised upon; the moment a man treats aught as unworthy of him, the eye within him is growing dim, he has become a scorner, and is in the way to become an atheist."

The Book is an attempt to collect, and present in pulpit addresses, the great central thoughts, the leading lessons, contained in the lives and writings of the Kings and Prophets of the Old Testament. We shall confine our present notice to his treatment of a few of the Prophecies.

He nowhere gives distinctly his view of the power and mission of the Prophets, nor of the manner in which God acted upon their minds, and fitted them for his purposes. This he leaves to be collected from his actual treatment of their writings, and the resulting impression is, though with some uncertainty and exceptions, that he mainly regards the Prophet as one who looked into the human affairs that were surrounding him with an eye made true and clear by a constant sense of God. In the Book of Joel, the earliest of the Prophets, whose writings he speaks of as a clear type of the ancient prophetic discourse, he apparently recognizes only a man of deep spiritual insight announcing to his nation the necessary judgments of a holy God, leading finally to the restorations and the mercies which could not be separated from the triumph of the Theocracy.

"That which Joel anticipates is the punishment of all these robbers of men and invaders of boundaries; some very sweeping and tremendous punishment which would resemble in its results the great battle which Jehoshaphat fought with the Moabites and Ammonites, or which (since the word Jehoshaphat bore that signification) would be a great judgment of God upon the nations. What nation should execute this punishment, the prophet does not declare. Only he is sure that it will be a great day of decision, very fearful to all who are engaged in it. He is sure that the righteous sentence of God upon those who have been committing unrighteous and unbrotherly acts will be seen in it. He is sure that the thieves will be forced to disgorge some of their unlawful prey. He is sure lastly that Jerusalem and Mount Zion will be brought through the conflict, 'Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation.'"

We agree with Mr. Maurice in thinking that Joel pre-

sents a clear type of the great characteristics of Hebrew Prophecy. The interest and value of the Book are indeed by no means of the highest : there are many prophesyings of deeper import, of loftier inspiration, more rich in religious instruction, of mightier power to communicate the intuition and fervour of the prophet's soul, but none in which the nature of the prophetic mission is more distinctly marked—more clearly separated from all admixture with that mechanical theory of Prophecy which has taken such obstinate hold on the English mind, which reduces to nothing the spiritual vitality of the Prophet himself, makes him a mere instrument in God's hands through which to give His spirit the form and sound of human words, and degrades these highest inspirations of the Almighty in the understanding heart of man to the level of the responses of a Heathen Oracle. In Joel we have manifestly no soothsayer, no seer swept away upon the visions of the future, and detached by the nature of his inward experiences from intimate association and fellowship with the world around him, no dealer in authoritative predictions, in mysterious disclosures of historical facts whilst as yet they lie waiting for their hour in the unwrapped folds of the dark mantle of time—but we have simply a mighty preacher of Righteousness, a man in living communion with his God, impressed to the depths of his being with the belief that the Almighty reigneth upon the earth, incapable therefore of contemplating the overwhelming events of Providence with the worldling's selfish prudence, or with the Atheist's stoic wisdom, incapable that is of adroitly dealing with mere external facts without penetrating to the intent of God which is expressed in them, which they carry and convey as surely as the sun carries the blessing of His light, and the cloud the blessing of His rain. We have in Joel a man so little absorbed or ensphered in the future, as if *that* was his place and the realm of his power, that he is looking with the most piercing insight into what is passing on the earth, going direct to the heart of present and visible things,—but with this difference from all others who deal intently with the Present, that as he is searching only for its spiritual significance, looking only for the mind of God clothed in the garment of its events,—he cannot find that mind of

God without light streaming from it over the Future as well as over the Present, for to find it is to find the flow of the Almighty's purpose, and no man deals livingly with existing things who does not see them in their eternal relations, in motion and in progress. Hence is it that the man of large spiritual insight, the preacher of Righteousness, the utterer of God's will and thought, must always speak like a Prophet, for he speaks out of his sympathy with the Spirit of Him, from whom are ever proceeding all the issues of life, whose Providence can never be confined within the aspects of the present time, which indeed is but an imaginary moment, gone as soon as named, bearing the burden of the Past and rushing towards the deliverance of the Future. He speaks out of his sympathy with the counsels of the Almighty's spirit, whose very judgments are never for Judgment's sake, but for the sake of new births of Righteousness, new movements of better life. The Prophet speaks of the desires of God's heart as though they were already flowing in the forms of realized life, for he knows that our Father's spirit is always striving to bring men into fellowship with His own intentions for us, and that the heart of man is so constituted that God cannot for ever be defeated. When darkness is covering the earth, and gross darkness the people, the Prophet knows as well as if he had seen it, that some visitation from the Almighty is impending, not only as the necessary and inert consequence of this moral death-sleep, but as its living and spiritual remedy proceeding from the conscious will of Him whose hand is ever seeking to touch the springs of our life. When the Rulers rule unrighteously, and the Priests utter vanity and make the Princes glad with their lies, the Prophet knows, as though he had already witnessed their downfall, that the national institutions are perishing at their roots, that the throne is tottering, and the altar profaned. And when the Devastation comes, the Prophet's eye is no more filled up with the Judgment than before it was closed in by the Sin; he sees in the interposition of God the pointings of a divine hand towards brighter destinies, and paints them as already come: it is no longer a time to threaten judgments when the doom has fallen; his strength is then better spent in drawing healing waters out of the stricken hearts, and in

exalting the downward look of Penitence into the upward gaze of Hope. And if the Prophet speaks of all these purposes of God, present and future, under the forms and the imagery of his inherited ideas, and of his national expectations, that is no more than the necessity of our nature exacts; no man can speak of God's purposes under higher spiritual forms than those which the highest life of his time is conversant with, and when the Prophet promises prosperity to Israel as the issue of judgment, if it will humble itself under the Almighty's hands, under the form of the triumphant Theocracy and the discomfiture of hereditary foes, it might be very difficult to prove that he was departing farther from the strictest truth of fact, than when the Christian comforts himself with some very earthly visions of heaven as the rewards of righteousness. The chief thing to remember is, that the prophet is not a spiritual magician, but the interpreter of God, one who knows the connections of the Almighty's will with the spiritual nature of man, and who when, like Joel, he reads judgments, and invokes penitence, and paints the promises, is admitted to the secrets of the divine mind, inasmuch as he discerns the inevitable tendencies of eternal Law, and devoutly believes in that inheritance for God's children, whenever they shall turn to Him, which is surely laid up for them in the holy love of their Father.

All that we know of Joel, and of the subject of his prophecies, has to be collected from the prophecies themselves. The only note of time they contain is that in their mention of the enemies of Judah we hear only of Idumea and of Egypt, and the cities of Tyre and Sidon. It is concluded therefore that Syria and Assyria had not yet become terrible to Judea. We have then here a lesson on their personal and political relations to God addressed to the Hebrew people, it may be some eight hundred and fifty years before Christ. That these relations were in external matters sometimes read amiss is not strange. That some Fanaticism mingled with their devotion, we of this age cannot afford to impute to them as a deep disgrace. The great and memorable fact is, that at that distant day we find this Hebrew Nation in calamity and prosperity bringing its daily life into recognized dependence upon God, in a manner that is true of no other

nation before or since. The immediate occasion of this ancient utterance of Righteousness and religious Hope was 'a great Day of Jehovah,' as any signal calamity was called by which the hearts of the people ought to be brought nigh to Him who does not rule us blindly, nor suffer any affliction to fall upon us without depositing in it the seeds of mightier blessing. The special calamity was a devastation by successive swarms of locusts, before which the food of the people perished. Under such calamity man is powerless; and when human power is annihilated by the divine will, only by alliance with the divine Spirit can we find access to patience or to expectation. In that true humiliation and devoutness of their souls the Prophet sees all the treasures of the divine Love already opened upon a people whose hearts offer no obstruction. Nor was this all: times of calamity whereby the people were brought back from their vain wanderings to the living God, and times of prosperity in which God was not only gracious but approving, were to a Prophet's heart but preparations for that great day of the Lord when the light that shone on Zion was to spread to all lands, and Jehovah to pour out his spirit upon all flesh. Thus could a note be struck to which every fibre of the national heart would vibrate, making the heaviest afflictions only the divine summons to that inward purification which God requires in His agents, and not the punishment but the apparelling of spirits. Every afflicted heart which affliction has made spiritually serene and clear has then its deepest conviction that God only requires that we should become entirely His, for Him to become entirely ours, and to work mightily through us the desires of His own Spirit. This confidence of ultimate victory through God, arising out of the entire submission and allegiance that is born of Sorrow, is universal to spiritual man,—though the form in which it shaped itself before the mind of a Jewish Prophet was necessarily derived from what he conceived to be the highest purposes of Jehovah, that the Theocracy should prevail, that its enemies should be humbled, that therefore Tyre and Sidon which seized upon the Jewish people and sold them to the Grecians for slaves, and Edom which snatched them as a prey and passed them over the border to Egyptian bondage, should be

judged and punished, and that "upon Mount Zion and in Jerusalem should deliverance be."—In accordance with this seems to be Mr. Maurice's view of the Prophet's insight.

In the same way, in the prophecies of Amos, who comes next in chronological order, our Author seems to discover nothing of the nature of miraculous predictions. Indeed the one pregnant instruction for the interpretation of the prophetic writings is that we look to contemporary History for the occasion of the Prophecy, and not to the Prophecy for the anticipation of History. In the circumstances, in the moral condition, in the foreign relations, in the sins and idolatries of the people, the Prophet with the clear and serene eye of spiritual and of political insight saw the shadows of the Future, the forecastings of Destiny, the slow, advancing steps of Judgment. In the prophecies of Amos there is not a single ruinous consequence announced which was not already beginning to be fulfilled. The train was laid and burning, which unless arrested must end as he predicts. Internal disorganization had commenced; the classes were looking at each other as natural enemies; the common people had long been reduced to poverty by the successful invasions of Syria, and by the frightful piracies and maraudings of that long chain of fierce nations which completely hemmed Palestine within a circle of watchful enmity. And, to bring all these sores and grievances to a powerful head, Jeroboam the Second of Israel by a prosperous inroad upon Syria, which the growing arm of Nineveh was just beginning to reach, had caused a sudden access of wealth to the ruling classes, so that the symptoms of national disease were obvious enough to the eye of the Prophet who, at such a time, saw with the Rich luxury and oppression, with the Poor famine and hatred. A man of a prophetic mind might in these days look into the bosom of families, and seeing their pursuits, their life, their objects, the bonds that hold them, predict their fates or their fortunes. A man of profound insight and reach of spirit looking now at the nations of Europe might possibly sketch all the leading outlines of the inevitable births of the next ten years. With Amos every thing was actually in course: the ruin had begun at every point, and might be seen advancing like the prairie fire: he had only to raise a cry that could

make itself heard above the general recklessness and guilt, a cry that the Avenger was fast upon them, and that unless by instant reformation he could be stopped, the nation's doom was sealed. And so Amos opens his prophecy, and calls it "what *he saw* concerning Israel in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash the king of Israel." The whole understanding and enjoyment of that prophecy is only to be had by imbuing the mind with the whole contemporary history and life of the nation, and without this it is clearly a very presumptuous thing to pronounce confidently, as though some interest of God was dependent upon it, on the natural or the supernatural character of the warnings, threatenings, visions of prosperity, and lurid flashes of judgment, that come from these great preachers of Righteousness.

There is one passage in the Book of Amos which shows that what is really valuable in the prophetic writings is in the unsparing application of a mighty spirit of Righteousness to the moral condition of the times,—the forecastings of destiny as seen in the temper of a nation's life, by a heart that was entirely God's. There is one passage in which Amos, with the natural feeling of a Jew who could not realize that his Dispensation was preparatory and must perish, ventures upon a pure prediction, deems indeed the honour of his God concerned in not permitting the chosen people to be for ever humbled before the nations, breaks through the clouds of judgment with sweet visions of prosperity, and plants Israel again upon the mountains of Samaria, now won back by affliction to her God, to dwell before him in perpetual glory. That is *prediction*: not spiritual foresight, but an attempt to foretell the future, from what was supposed to be the design of God:—and it has not been fulfilled. The captives of Israel never were brought back; the ten Tribes are lost, and no Christian conceives that God ever designs to restore their polity, and give them the Nations to possess for ever. Yet we perceive how natural was such a vision to a Jew whose soul, mighty and simple as it was, could not see beyond the system in which he lived, and who identifying it with the highest purpose of God, conceived of it as everlasting. But this does not abate one

jot his true glory as a Prophet, one who cleaved the moral Future not by an infallible intellect but by an inspired heart,—who showed the nation the tendencies of its ways,—who tore the disguise from every pretence,—unveiled the wrongs and sufferings of the poor,—and announced the inevitable judgments of God upon the selfish luxuries of the great. On the circumstantial difficulty of interpretation Mr. Maurice is silent—but on the temper of religious hope which believes that only Good can eventually come from God, Mr. Maurice remarks with that characteristic spirit of simple, earnest Faith, which gives their chief value to his religious writings.

“Does it seem to you that a hope so confident as this—a hope of life arising out of death, light out of darkness, is inconsistent with that vision of utter ruin which rose up a moment ago before us? Brethren, we shall not know the heart of the Jewish prophet—we shall not know our own—till we learn to see not only how these things are compatible, but why they are inseparable. Amos would not have left his sheepfolds to denounce the idolatries of Israel if he had not felt that men, that his own countrymen, were maintaining a fearful fight against a Will which had a right to govern them, and which could alone govern them for their good. He could not have been sustained in the witness which he bore if an ever-brightening revelation of the Perfect Goodness,—of that Goodness, active, energetic, converting all powers and influences to its own righteous and gracious purposes,—had not accompanied revelations that became every moment more awful, of the selfishness and disorder to which men were yielding themselves. From the observation of this strife, as history and experience present it to the mind of a man, earnestly loving his fellow creatures, there came forth only the most fearful and despairing auguries. It is precisely because he has not only experience and history to guide him, but the certainty of an Eternal God, present in all the convulsions of society, never ceasing to act upon the individual heart when it is most wrapped in the folds of its pride and selfishness; it is precisely because he finds this to be true, whatever else is false, that he must hope.”

We are not a little astonished to find Mr. Maurice interpreting the introductory chapters of Hosea in the most literal sense. He believes that God commanded the Prophet actually to marry an adulterous wife and to have several profligate and licentious children, in order that the base manner in which the Nation fulfilled her

relations to her heavenly Husband and King might be thus symbolized. It is difficult to conceive how the Prophet was to secure that his children should turn out profligate and licentious, however vile their mother might be; more difficult to conceive how a righteous man could act upon such instructions; still more difficult to conceive how any national lesson was to be taught by a series of events that extended over a marriage and the births of three children; and most difficult of all to conceive how a man like Mr. Maurice can attribute to God such a mixture of practical absurdity and of gross immorality. For there is really no difficulty in the passage to force the mind on such a revolting interpretation. God is represented as telling the Prophet to marry an unfaithful wife and to have a shameful offspring, that by such a supposition, brought home to his own heart and feelings, he might realize and depict to others, the manner in which the Nation and her children had abused their relations to Him who was seeking to be unto them as a Husband and a Father.

There are two celebrated passages of Isaiah in regard to which we rejoice to have Mr. Maurice's opinion that the Prophet was not predicting a distant future, but applying the insight that was in him to the events and auguries of his own times. To Hezekiah Mr. Maurice applies the prophecy,—“Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.” He first quotes at length the thirteenth chapter of the Second Book of Chronicles, in which is detailed Hezekiah's great attempt to unite the whole Nation once more in a common Worship at Jerusalem, and then reasons thus:—

“You will remark the many curious coincidences between this passage and the one which is before us, and you will ask yourselves whether an Israelite acquainted with the words of Isaiah,* could possibly fail to connect these in some way or other with this memorable act of Hezekiah.

“But would he therefore be authorized to say that the next clause of my text applies to Hezekiah,—‘For unto us a Child is

* Isaiah ix. 1, 2.

born; unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder'?—Words follow which may well make us tremble at such an interpretation. And yet with the facts which show that in the days of this prince a greater calamity was preparing for both Samaria and Judah than any which had ever befallen them, and that just then there was to be this invitation of all the tribes to a union which they had not known for generations,—this actual acceptance of it by some,—this divine pledge in the old national feast that God Himself intended it for them all,—I cannot think that we are justified in setting aside the reference to Hezekiah as blasphemous till we have thoroughly considered what such a reference could imply.

"The peculiarity of Hezekiah's act was this. He did not, like Rehoboam, Amaziah, or any of his predecessors, seek to recover the ten tribes to himself as part of his possession and appanage because he was the heir of David. He did not treat them as mere revolters, who if they would not submit to him must be left to their own courses. Nor on the other hand did he, like Jehoshaphat, make alliances with them in spite of their idolatry. What he did was to claim one and all of them as children of God's covenant; as entitled to a share in the feast which declared that they were delivered from Pharaoh and brought under a divine and gracious government. All past grudges and offences were forgotten. The civil objection that they were once in rebellion and had become corrupted in blood by long adherence to rebellion, was cast aside. The religious objection that the worship of calves and of Baal had cut them off from their ancient rights, that they had in effect made themselves heathens, was overcome even in the instances where the proof in favour of it appeared more decisive and overwhelming. Even the divinely-ordained formalities for the festival were not allowed to stand in the way. They had not cleansed themselves. 'They ate otherwise than it was written.' Still Hezekiah prayed, 'The good Lord pardon every one.'

"What would be the result of such a noble unselfish policy upon the minds of those who heeded the call to the Passover—ultimately perhaps, in after days of humiliation and captivity, on the minds of many who mocked at it? They would at once be led back, the king being their guide, to thoughts of another King than him, of One at whose words the hosts of the oppressor had sunk like lead in the mighty waters, who had gone with them through the wilderness, who had claimed them as a people of inheritance to Himself. Conceive a race sitting in great darkness, not less idolatrous than the people among whom they dwelt, but with a vague sense of being separated from them by some peculiar traditions and external signs which made a hearty participation in their idolatry impossible,—a

people which had the lowest, basest, most frightful notions of some unseen power whom they ought, if possible, to propitiate, either by Phœnician rites or by some half-remembered miserably distorted forms which their fathers had taught them—conceive such a people sunk in hopelessness, sensuality, slavery, hearing the message that the God of their fathers was seeking after them, was inviting them to join with all their kinsmen and countrymen in praising Him as their past and present deliverer, the God who would remain the same, though the earth should melt and the foundation of the hills should be dissolved. It is difficult to find any language sufficient for such an occasion. This gospel was the Revelation of a God to this poor, degraded people, one most unlike any in whom they had believed, yet not a new God, the very God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, the very one of whom their consciences testified in the midst of their sensuality and idolatry. It was the revelation of a fellowship with a people whom they had looked upon as enemies, to a set of men who had never known what fellowship was among themselves; yet who had a thousand tokens in their domestic relations, even in their ordinary occupations, most of all in the deep yearnings of their hearts, that they were not meant for isolation, rivalry, hostility."

That we may not incur any risk of doing injustice to Mr. Maurice's orthodoxy, it is only right that we should quote the following passage, to the effect that in Hezekiah the people perhaps, and certainly the Prophet, would see the image of a higher King, of a greater Reconciler and Redeemer: and in this we think his interpretation in agreement with the whole spirit and method of the Jewish economy.

"The growing youth was the type of a regenerated royal race, the prophet's child of a regenerated nation. But were those pledges and types merely addressed to the fancy? Were they merely soothing suggestions which might keep alive a hope soon to be crushed utterly by facts?—No, for the original stock of royalty was not David; the nation did not derive its vitality from Abraham. There was a divine stock, an eternal seed, out of which both had proceeded. That stock could not wear out, that seed could never become less vital or germinant than it had been. The words, 'Unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given,' were the rapturous EUREKA of the prophet when this truth had dawned with full power upon his spirit. But that spirit at once confesses that the truth has been *given*; the search may have been long, the travail hard, but God was Himself leading him on to the discovery. And

what a discovery ! Beneath the infinite confusion into which the land had fallen there lay a principle of unity which nothing could break or destroy. That is our cold, hard, unreal phraseology. Isaiah could use words that were true and living. The principle is a *Person* ; the centre of unity is a *Son* ; the Government is on His shoulders ; He is an actual King ; His name is Secret or Wonderful ; the eye sees Him not ; the heart owns Him with awe and confusion ; He is the Counsellor, the source of Wisdom, the spring of all intuition and of all discourse ; the discoverer of intents, the guide to acts. He is—it must be spoken—‘He can be none else than the Mighty God, the Creator of Man’—He who said, Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness. He it is who imparts to the generations of men that fixedness which man owns amidst all the transitoriness and vicissitudes which he experiences. ‘He is the Father of the everlasting age.’ And lastly—for thus we end where we began—He is the Prince of Peace, the bond of that fellowship which all the wilfulness of kings and the disorders of tribes could not sever.

“ This centre of unity Isaiah opposes to all the petty, paltry confederacies which the tribes were forming against each other. They would all be broken in pieces. A sweeping whirlwind would carry them all away. But here was a safe resting place for the hopes of all true Israelites ; here was a certain assurance of revival amidst the confusion of parties, amidst the utter failure of human leaders. Not some great champion suddenly appearing cheered the soul of the prophet. Champions were gone. Isaiah had seen every staff broken upon which the people might lean. The birth of a child in weakness into an unintelligible distracted world was the symbol of triumph ; for that showed that the Son of God was himself come down to the battle-field, that He was gathering together the hosts, few and feeble in the eyes of man, which were to avenge the cause of Israel.

“ When I say *the Son of God*, I do not mean to pronounce how far Isaiah was conscious whether the title ‘Son’ referred to a human or a divine parentage. The truth had dawned upon him that there must be one intimately related to God, and also the Lord and Prince of his nation, one who bore up the pillars of the earth, though those who were called the children of the Most High were dealing madly and were to die like men. It required fresh sorrows, fresh revelations, to bring that truth into perfect clearness in his mind, to show that the Son of God must in the fullest sense be the Son of Man. We must not anticipate the gradual unfolding of so mighty a conviction, which if it is really to dwell in every heart, must penetrate all its other thoughts and beliefs, and subordinate them to itself. Least of all must we complain if the prophet passes

from a glorious announcement which concerns all times—us more than himself—to the local incidents and troubles that were affecting his own generation. If we do not care to follow him when he denounces Samaritans, who say ‘the bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewn stones; the sycamores are fallen down, but we will change them into cedars;’—if we think it signifies nothing to us whether or not Manasseh vexes Ephraim or Ephraim Manasseh;—if we would pass over the description of the Assyrian hosts and the exposition of the divine purpose in sending them against a hypocritical nation;—if we see no force or comfort in the declaration that the tyrant of the earth fancied he had a power of his own to cut down the trees of Lebanon, whereas he was but the axe with which God was hewing them down;—if we pass by all these utterances that we may dwell on some favourite passage like that of which I have been speaking to-day, or like that in the eleventh chapter, which describes the lamb and the lion feeding together, we shall I fear lose the true and full meaning of the sentences which we have chosen for our exclusive, certainly not for our exaggerated, admiration. If we adopt the headings which divines or printers have affixed to our chapters, and determine that such and such a paragraph denotes the flourishing state of the Kingdom of Christ, we may extract from them a kind of meaning,—we *shall* extract the indication of an excellent meaning;—but I am afraid that we shall go away with a very loose notion of this kingdom, of what makes its state weak or flourishing, of the relation in which our own times or our own selves stand to it. Whereas if we had allowed the prophet to teach us how he had acquired his lore respecting a divine King or a divine Kingdom, I believe we should understand infinitely better in what way his prophecies relate to after periods in the life of the Church and of the World, and how it has pleased God to educate one and another into the knowledge of Himself.”

The other class of passages on which we rejoice to have Mr. Maurice’s admissions are those which relate to the suffering King and People: and for the vindication of our own interpretation, and scriptural theology, we ask no more than these concessions.

“Who is he that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah, this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? The Jew asks whether this is not the description of a triumphant conqueror returning from the defeat of the Heathen. Unquestionably. The Church which appointed the service for Passion-week did not wish us to forget that all the symbols of the prophet pointed to such a Person. Only she would have us remember that he is the same person whose visage is said

to be marred more than any man's; who is declared to be the despised and rejected of men—a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. She asks us to understand that out of that contempt, sorrow, and humiliation, all might comes; that the nations could never be subdued except by one who wrestled with the death and sin which all nations share together. The Jew asks again whether the Man of Sorrows may not be Isaiah or Hezekiah, the deserted prophet, the humbled king; whether he may not exhibit the condition of the Jewish race? Unquestionably. Isaiah was a Man of Sorrows; throughout the most blessed periods of Hezekiah's life he was a Man of Sorrows. The Jewish race is represented throughout the prophecy as crushed, helpless, broken;—*by* its misery and desolation, the channel of blessings to mankind. The more Isaiah, Hezekiah, the Jewish nation, understood this great secret, this divine paradox, the more was each enabled to do the work which each was appointed to do in the world. And this because the image of a higher and more perfect sorrow, of the man who could alone be called *the* man of sorrows, of Him who enabled them to be true sorrowers, of one sympathizing with the mind of God and the woes of His creatures, rose then more clearly and brightly and perfectly before them."

There is one declaration so honourable to our Author's candour and largeness of spirit, that we gladly give it a place here. His subject was Ezekiel's Vision, and the occasion Trinity Sunday.

"Ezekiel saw a throne, and there was a likeness as of the appearance of a Man, above it. There is One human and divine, from whom this spirit has proceeded, in whom it dwells perfectly. Beneath that divine form is a glory too awful for the prophet's gaze. He falls upon his face and listens while a voice speaks to him.

"Is it then,' some one will ask, 'in very deed the mystery of this day which the prophet's vision is bringing before us? Does not such a notion proceed from the eagerness of the imagination to find analogies where they do not exist, or from our foolish desire to establish a doctrine which is above comprehension, not by a simple appeal to faith, but by hints and allusions drawn from teachers who would have been utterly perplexed by our interpretation of their thoughts and language?'

"Brethren, let me speak plainly on this point. I do not say that you will find the doctrine which we have been proclaiming today, in this chapter. I do not believe that you can. I have not the slightest wish to find it there, or to put it there. It would be a shock to all my convictions if I thought that Ezekiel was enunciating

ing a dogma when he professed to be recording a vision ; or that the mystery which, as the church teaches us by the order of her services, could not be revealed till Christ was glorified and the Spirit given, was already made known to the prophet as he sat among the captives by the river Chebar. I cannot say how much mischief seems to me to be done, when instead of striving to follow strictly the statements of the Old Testament writers, we insist upon wringing out of texts or symbols, which we have moulded according to our fancy, the proof of some New Testament revelation. It is not the Law and the Prophets only which suffer from such violence. The Gospels and the Apostles suffer much more. The truths which they set forth as living foundations of our existence, social and personal, shrivel into jejune formulas, subjects for controversy and reviling, prized mainly as texts by which other men may be convicted of error."

We recommend this volume to the careful study of our readers. It passes under review the history of the Jewish Kingdom and Sacred Literature, from Saul to Zedekiah, from Samuel to Ezekiel. They will find in it not only rich helps, but also strong attractions, to the intelligent reading of the Prophecies, the noblest department of Jewish eloquence, though the least relished because the least understood. If its rich vein of historical and spiritual exposition is sometimes tinged and affected by the matter of a foreign theology, our Author himself always affords the needful means and hints for its detection and elimination.

ART. II.—MEMOIRS OF THOMAS MOORE.

Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore.
 Edited by the Right Honourable Lord John Russell,
 M.P. London: Longmans. 1853.

A FIRST impression is almost never wholly erased. What a man was the first time we saw him, what a writer was the first time we read him, that to the end of our days, or his days, he continues to us to be. There may be a second man, a second writer, a second self,—superinduced upon the first; but it rarely if ever entirely obliterates the earlier. There they are fixed together, the one in the past, the other in the present—the one in the memory, the other in the eye. Nay, he is a very strong man, or a very much-present man, who even can add his later to his former self in our impressions of him. He is usually but a kind of commentator on his former self, sharing the fate of commentators, whose truths and corrections are far less impressed upon the reader's mind and memory, than the errors and mistakes of the original author. Something of this kind occurs to us all with Moore. It requires time and effort to put the later and the earlier man together, and make a reality and a unity of the compound. Little—Anacreon—Lalla Rookh,—the Melodies—and the Squibs—all go very well together. But what are we to do with the writer of interesting Biographies, and not unlearned travels in search of religion, the sender of two letters a week—not to Phillis or Chloe—but to an absent mother? What are we to do with the generous and dutiful son—the mindful brother—the industrious independent man—the lover of home and family—the offerer of prayers, by the bed-side of a sick wife? And yet what is there really in this contradiction (if it be a contradiction), this contrast (if it be anything more than growth and supplement), but what the lives of many thousands of true and earnest men supply us with every day? What is the difference between this moral series and many others of the like kind presented to us daily? That merry, roguish boy, and that grave clergyman—that light-

hearted, gaiety-loving, and perhaps not always very strictly self-controlled youth, and that worthy burgher and careful *pater-familias*, or that thin, pale-faced judge, pronouncing sentence on a too-far extended frolic or escapade—they are the same—the beginning and the end of similar series. The great difference between such cases and Moore's is, that Moore took a portrait of himself at nineteen—and two or three more at short intervals afterwards—and everybody bought one or other of them, and nobody could ever forget them. Whereas the lineaments of the character of the majority of men are traced in their youth only upon the consciousness of a few contemporaries—so that when the mature likeness appears before the world—it is the first—it has nothing to displace—it seems the only form in which these lineaments had ever existed—the grave man is accepted—the frolicsome youth remains for ever unknown.

Though "the late Mr. Little," therefore, not only hypothetically, but actually and morally, probably died at "the early age of twenty-one," yet his juvenile characteristics being "married to immortal verse," have as long a life as the verse itself in most people's memories, and the associations of that early authorship stick like blisters to Thomas Moore. With those who had the pleasure of Moore's acquaintance and friendship, these early prurencies of imagination soon died away, and were replaced by impressions of a more respectable and indeed accurate description. They knew him as a man of warm and affectionate dispositions—of domestic character—of laboriousness and independence—of earnest patriotism and of varied and extensive acquisition and knowledge. But to the general public these things were not so fully known—so that by them some little surprise was at first felt that the Premier of England should condescend to the editing of the letters and journals of Thomas Moore. But the unconscious Premier, moving in a circle in which Moore's actual mode of life and thought were better known—felt no dishonour attach to the task of discharging this office for the effective partizan, as well as the celebrated biographer and poet, or any discredit to connect itself with his avowal of intimacy and friendship with the man. Dismissing then from our own minds, and entreat-

ing our readers to dismiss from theirs, all undue and disproportioned associations with "Little's Lyrics"—"Anacreon Moore," "Tom Moore," &c., &c., we wish to apply ourselves to the two volumes before us, as affording materials for the study of the actual man, in his best and most permanent attributes.

It does not appear that Lord John Russell has much to do with the present volumes, except lending his name to them as their Editor. A simple and kindly preface—with a short disquisition on poetry—as good as might be expected from a nobleman of fair mental culture, who has led too busy a political life to have taken at any time more than a taste of Hippocrene,—with probably some care of selection and arrangement, and a most brief and occasional note or two of explanation—comprehend all that the Editor has to do with the volumes before us. Indeed there are marks of the work of selection and arrangement having been mostly performed by poor Moore himself before his death—in the double anticipation probably of helping in the provision for those whom he expected to leave behind, and of saving his noble Editor as much unnecessary trouble as possible. So far, then, not only by the contribution of letters and journals, but, if we are right in our impression, by the actual superintendence of the author himself, in the selection of material, the volumes before us are essentially and entirely an autobiography.

Indeed, as regards the literary part of his life, this may be called the second time that Moore has now been his own biographer; and those who are familiar with the prefaces written by himself to the several volumes of his works collected in 1841-42, will find a not inconsiderable portion of the literary notices in the present work anticipated by what Moore wrote then. "Finding," as he says in the first of these prefaces, "that in no country is there so much curiosity felt respecting the interior of the lives of public men as in England," he took from the journal already written such materials, as might gratify the public curiosity, without violating the confidence of private and social life. The journal itself, now published, is of course fuller, richer, and more interesting, than the foretaste of its quality which these prefaces afforded.

His natural genius, and a rather ambitious mother, se-

curing nurture for its growth, and opportunity for its exhibition, formed the groundwork of Moore's after-celebrity, and of—we suppose we must call it, with all its accompanying struggles and anxieties—his success in life.

The little wine-store in Dublin had a parlour behind it, and within that parlour a very clever lad, with a mother clever enough to perceive it, and ambitious enough to wish to make the most of him. Accordingly she secured him the best education, and the best society, that her means and opportunities would allow. Mr. Whyte, his schoolmaster, was elocutionary and theatrical, according to the taste of the cleverer middle-class people of that day. Amidst the theatrical society of his aunt's supper-table it was that Southey drew in his first breath of literary influences, and felt the collision that first wakens to the sense of intellectual power and the thirst for increasing it. A little earlier Goethe was going through the same course of stimulant, we presume, in Germany. The ambition of Moore's parents for their son even led them to entertain the question, whether they should not bring him up as a Protestant, as, at that time especially, no career was open to a young Roman Catholic in England or Ireland. Shame, doubt, inherited prepossessions, and finally principle, came in to determine them to take the side of honesty. As with many other men, whose parents, in their timidity, fear that they are lessening the chances of worldly good to their children, by preferring something else to its unscrupulous pursuit, nothing could have turned out more fortunate for the youth than the spirited honesty of this course. A liberal Catholic of talent was, in the then state of political parties, just the person to be useful, patronized, caressed, admired. There was Moore made for the occasion—large-hearted, well-informed, full of toleration and kindness, free from all narrowness and prejudice. The worse specimen he was of a *true* son of such a church, the better party-specimen he was for those who desired to enlist public sympathy in favour of emancipation. This man was an example of the excluded, dreaded, persecuted Papist! This very untoward circumstance (as his parents thought it) of his religion, was all in his favour with the only set of great people who would have admitted him to their society, and poured upon him their admiration and regard—the Whig

aristocracy. Had he been brought up a good Tory conformist, by the policy of his parents, he would in the first place have belied his nature and antecedents, and would have gone forth a Samson shorn of his hair—unable to do an honest, hearty work—placed amid a cause and patrons alien and uncongenial to his whole man. He would have been a cramped and unnatural Conservative, instead of a natural and genuine Liberal; and the result upon his genius, though not destructive—nothing could destroy it—would have been disastrous. Then, too, the Whig aristocracy were many of them clever themselves, and laid themselves out for the encouragement of talent, admitting it into easy and graceful union with their own. Whereas the Tory aristocracy were stiff, stupid, and proud, supposing that a low-born genius was not good enough for them; whereas the unhappy truth was, that he was too good, and that they could not appreciate him. Bitterly did the whole party rue their dulness and their *hauteur*, when they saw the result in the brilliant staff, it might be called, of wit, genius, and spirit, which the Whigs gathered round them to do the work of their party and their principles upon the heart of the nation. Thus, Thomas Moore, by being put upon an honest track, did a great and serious work in this kingdom, by his squibs and crackers, his songs and his bon-mots, and is to be reckoned among the most effective and successful of the patriotic labourers for Ireland and for freedom. But the touch also of the world, which his mother infused into his heart, and which adhered to him all his life, was not without its use in pushing him forward. She had always sought for him, and habituated him to, society superior to that by which he was naturally and by position surrounded. This early gave him that ease of manner, and that free courtesy, without which a man's company is too apt to be cumbrous, restrained, and restraining, and which made him, when he afterwards came to London, drop upon the bed of the fine aristocratic soil as an indigenous plant. It has to be confessed that his singing—and that singing accompanied by himself (for his poor mother had stretched a point to get him a piano)—and that singing and playing of his own verses—and the singing, and music, and poetry, being all excellent—had much to do with his early and easy transit across the

fashionable world. Perhaps there is something not unhumiliating in this recollection. But then he did not get his dinner for his song alone. He was the most agreeable, mannerly, amusing, witty, and well-informed of men *after* dinner. Theodore Hook we suppose was his only parallel in our time; and what a contrast in other respects between the two men! Hook, with his conversation and wonderful extempore melody and versification among his haughty Tory society, who admitted and relished him without loving and respecting him; but obliged, after sitting with them late in the evening, to start off early in the morning to town to write *incognito* the article that was to give him the means of posting back, and to appear at the dinner-table in the evening, as if he had been loitering away the whole day! Moore doing a work of which he was in no way ashamed—seeking to inform, to improve, and to liberate, as well as to fascinate and divert. At the same time no man—whatever be his worth and genius, being poor and profession-less, and yet seeking the society of the wealthy and the great—can escape the penalty of a position essentially false, in the *contretemps* and mortifications to which it exposes him. An indication of this, as it affects the sentiment of the relation, is betrayed by Moore in the struggle of his self-respect with his work as an entertainer of the great—when he mentions the effort he made one day to sing one of his pieces in such a way as to make the Lansdownes *feel* its power; and again, another indication of the same painful consciousness in a commoner matter is given in his writing to one of his publishers for a little money to relieve him from the turtle-soup and claret of a high sheriff's country house, which he is obliged to continue swallowing for weeks together, because he has not a shilling in his pocket with which to give the servants their vales! Notwithstanding all which, Moore was in all his personal associations and tastes a thorough little aristocrat. When the grand exception of his own family is made—to whom he was always affectionate, generous, and constant—there is to us a painful absence, in the volumes before us, of any tolerable admixture of those intercourses and friendships with humbler people, which a man of Moore's native position and circumstances must have had if they had not been avoided and discouraged. His correspondence and friendship are

almost always with celebrities. The table of his life is strewn with porcelain. When he is looking out for god-fathers or godmothers for his children, he usually looks out for them among the titled, or, at least, the celebrated. His anxiety to obtain the Marquis of Lansdowne's name on one of these occasions, the failure of his heart to put the question two or three times, and the final triumph and achievement, do not, to our feelings, speak entirely well for him, or relieve him from an impression of tuft-hunting. We should like to have seen more signs in a man of the people keeping up his intercourse with them, more records of early and humbler friendships, apart from the circle of his own immediate family, fostered and preserved. His wife seems to have felt oppressively this constant hanging on the skirts of high life. Moore writes from Sloper-ton, Jan., 1818, to Lady Donegal:—

"We are getting on here as quietly and comfortably as possible; and the only thing I regret is, the want of some near and plain neighbours for Bessy to make intimacy with, and enjoy a little tea-drinking now and then, as she used to do in Derbyshire."

He then speaks of her visits and charities among the poor in the neighbourhood, and adds:—

"After many exertions to get Bessy to go and dine there (the Marquis of Lansdowne's), I have at last succeeded this week, in consequence of our being on a visit at Bowles's, and her having the shelter of the poet's old lady to protect her through the enterprize. She did not, however, at all like it; and I shall not often put her to the torture of it. In addition to her democratic pride—which I cannot blame her for—which makes her prefer the company of her equals to that of her superiors, she finds herself a perfect stranger in the midst of people who are all intimate; and this is a sort of dignified desolation which poor Bessy is not at all ambitious of. Vanity gets over all these difficulties; but pride is not so practicable. She is, however, very much pleased both with Lord and Lady Lansdowne; who have indeed been everything that is kind and amiable to her."—Vol. II. p. 129.

Moore's first launch upon the great world, after his studies at Trinity College, Dublin, was when his poor parents scraped a few guineas together and sent him to London to commence the study of the law, or rather to enter the Temple. His letters on this and subsequent occasions, written on the way, with the unknown future looming before the poor boy, are natural and touching.

The journey—as his letters from Chester on one occasion, and on his arrival in town on another, show—was dilatory and costly. Every fresh delay was a fresh demand upon his scantily-supplied purse, and a fresh wound on his home- and parent-loving heart. But the rapidity and brilliancy of his progress in the society of London take himself and the reader by surprise. Every new friend brings another. Every fresh introduction procures a second. His musical and poetical talent secures him an *entrée*, which his subsequently-discovered worth, and wit, and knowledge, continually deepens into intimacy. But the great lack is the absence of indispensable, omnipotent cash. Dinners do not furnish breakfasts; routs do not supply coach-hire; musical entertainments will not be made to pay lodging and laundry. But hope was wonderfully active with him, and on apparently very good ground. The future promised to pay the bills drawn on the present. His talents were sure (it was declared) to command success and bread. The first (which can, however, be waited for) they had already commanded; the second (which, unhappily, cannot be waited for) is what they did not yet secure. Nevertheless, the dear mother's thin purse at home, slightly distended by great effort and sparing, to be reduced again immediately to its former size for her absent boy, and a good uncle if we remember aright, and perhaps a patient and believing tradesman or two, and a good-natured friend who "happens to have it about him," hold young Moore's head above water, as they have done many a less and few more deserving youths, until the golden showers begin slowly to gather and sparingly to distil in Paternoster-row, and a few short years more of struggling (taking to their alleviation and relief, of course, a young wife and a small family in the interim), see at length independence throned upon the top of his quill; booksellers entreating; author hesitating; bankers honoring; the public devouring; and the poet and his young family eating the bread of industry, but with painfulness and care.

But all this was not to be gained in holiday-keeping London. Any writing which gains a man his bread is very hard work, the hardest perhaps that there is. Moore did not want or relish such a life in itself. It was not at all his ideal. He was, however, fit for no profession, ex-

cept that of pleasing and instructing mankind. The only permanent means of support that he could look for would be some one out of the many—some small one out of the great and little—good things, which were at the disposal of his grand associates. This was the hope of his future—it might be realized this year or this decade. No one knew. "The darkest day—live till to-morrow—will have passed away." This Moore, as much as any man, believed. But then, he had to live till to-morrow. That was his problem in the meantime. This living till to-morrow, he saw better than most poets, could only be accomplished independently and honourably by working to-day. He accordingly fled the distractions and engagements of town and society, and betook himself to a cottage in Derbyshire. This cottage (or its successor) was hard by a palace, and this palace contained within in it an excellent library and a hospitable dinner-table. Here then the books and the society—some presence of which was essential to Moore's industry and happiness—were furnished in useful and stimulating, not in oppressive or distracting, amounts. Lord Moira left the poet the free run of his library, even in his own absence; and thus he spent whole mornings, walking back to his humble home and affectionate wife each afternoon when his task was done, just as previously, while residing in London, he had resorted to the same hospitable mansion, and stayed in it for weeks together by himself. No mention of these circumstances occurs in the present volumes more hearty or interesting to our minds, than that which we find in the preface to the 7th vol. of his collected Works:—

"Among my earlier poetic writings, more than one grateful memorial may be found of the happy days I passed in this hospitable mansion—

'Of all my sunny morns and moonlight nights
On Donington's green lawns and breezy heights.'

But neither verse nor prose could do any justice to the sort of impression I still retain of those long-vanished days. The library at Donington was extensive and valuable; and through the privilege kindly granted to me of retiring thither for study, even when the family were absent, I frequently passed whole weeks alone in that fine library, indulging in all the first airy castle-building of authorship. The various projects, indeed, of future works that used then

to pass in fruitless succession through my mind, can be compared only to the waves, as described by the poet—

‘And one no sooner touch’d the shore and died,
Than a new follower rose.’

With that library is also connected another of my earlier poems, the verses addressed to the Duke of Montpensier on his portrait of the Lady Adelaide Forbes; for it was there that this truly noble lady, then in the first dawn of her beauty, used to sit for that picture; while in another part of the library, the Duke of Orleans—engaged generally at that time with a volume of Clarendon—was by such studies unconsciously preparing himself for the high and arduous destiny, which not only the good genius of France, but his own sagacious and intrepid spirit, had early marked out for him.”

The “*Lalla Rookh*,” as well as other subsequent works in prose and verse, is based upon the results of arduous study. In truth, the light-hearted writer of levities, Thomas Moore, was a student only less laborious and varied than Robert Southey. Even his lightest turns and touches (strange as such things appear to those who do not know that the very ease, and simplicity, and perspicuity, which seem so natural and unstudied are for the most part only produced by the greatest labour) demanded hours of thought and experiment. The restless walk to and fro in his garden betokened the labouring mind within, and might end in nothing, after a whole morning’s effort, but some happy half-line, fortunate even if rewarded thus. Such is the ease with which melodies are composed! Such the facility with which those who write for the public win their bread! Besides his longer work—the “*Lalla Rookh*,” for which he received 3000*l.*—he had a kind of standing order for songs from the Powers, reckoned at about 500*l.* a-year. He turned society and observation, as well as solitude and study, to the same purpose, though in a different form. At the houses of the Whig aristocracy he heard of the party manœuvres, hopes, jokes, and disappointments; of the last new trick of the Prince; of the last tear of Lord Eldon; of the last argument and conspiracy against liberal measures; and turned them all into the most effective thrusts at the enemy that it was possible to conceive, filling his Whig friends with radiant joy, the Tory Ministers with mortification and annoyance, and convulsing the public with unmitigated and irrepressible

laughter. These squibs and satires were in the mouths and memories of thousands of people the morning after they appeared, just as the songs of the same charming poet were on their lips and hearts in the evening.

Indeed, he turned every opportunity and experience of life to account. After the honey of "Lalla Rookh" was well jarred, a visit to Paris supplied him with some charming lemon-juice in the form of the "Fudge Family," to qualify the lusciousness of that somewhat over-sweet performance.

The preface from which we have already quoted, furnishes us with an account of the immediate origin of the "Fudge Family."

"The success (far exceeding my hopes and deserts) with which 'Lalla Rookh' was immediately crowned, relieved me at once from the anxious feeling of responsibility under which, as my readers have seen, that enterprise had been commenced, and which continued some time to haunt me amidst all the enchantments of my task. I was, therefore, in the true holiday mood, when a dear friend, with whose name are associated some of the brightest and pleasantest hours of my life*, kindly offered me a seat in his carriage for a short visit to Paris. This proposal I, of course, most gladly accepted; and, in the autumn of the year 1817, found myself, for the first time, in that gay capital. As the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty was still of too recent a date for any amalgamation to have taken place between the new and ancient order of things, all the most prominent features of both *régimes* were just then brought, in their fullest relief, into juxtaposition; and accordingly, the result was such as to suggest to an unconcerned spectator quite as abundant matter for ridicule as for grave political consideration."—"To me, the abundant amusement and interest which such a scene could not but afford, was a good deal heightened by my having, in my youthful days, been made acquainted with some of those personages who were now most interested in the future success of the legitimate cause. The Comte d'Artois, or Monsieur, I had met in the year 1802-3, at Donington Park, the seat of the Earl of Moira, under whose princely roof I used often and long, in those days, to find a most hospitable home. A small party of distinguished French emigrants were already staying on a visit in the house when Monsieur and his suite arrived; and among those were the present King of France and his two brothers, the Duc de Montpensier, and the Comte de Beaujolais. Some doubt and uneasiness had, I remember, been felt by the two latter brothers, as to the reception

• Mr. Rogers.

they were likely to encounter from the new guest ; and as, in those times, a cropped and unpowdered head was regarded generally as a symbol of Jacobinism, the Comte Beaujolais, who, like many other young men, wore his hair in this fashion, thought it on the present occasion most prudent, in order to avoid all risk of offence, not only to put powder in his hair, but also to provide himself with an artificial queue. This measure of precaution, however, led to a slight incident after dinner, which, though not very royal or dignified, was, at least, creditable to the social good humour of the future Charles X. On the departure of the ladies from the dining-room, we had hardly seated ourselves in the old-fashioned style, round the fire, when Monsieur, who had happened to place himself next to Beaujolais, caught a glimpse of the ascitic tail, which, having been rather carelessly put on, had a good deal straggled out of its place. With a sort of scream of jocular pleasure, as if delighted at the discovery, Monsieur seized the stray appendage, and, bringing it round into full view, to the great amusement of the whole company, popped it into poor grinning Beaujolais' mouth."

Notwithstanding the many assuaging ministrations which his lot received from the attention of Lords and the remittances of Publishers, Moore felt that his mode of life was too precarious, too anxious, too laborious and wearying to be contemplated as desirable in itself or as a permanence. His desire was undiminished therefore to obtain some post from his friends, when, by their participation in government or influence with it, they should have it in their power to assign him a suitable one. The Laureateship he declined as insufficient, and likely, if it were accepted, to be regarded as a settling of his claims. A Judgeship in Bermuda, the province of which was to make award in cases of prize-capture, expecting that it would be tolerably lucrative, he had accepted early in life, but finding that the former duties and emoluments of the office had been divided with the other places, and that in their reduced form they gave him neither enough to do, nor enough to live upon, he returned to England, leaving his office in the charge of a deputy. This deputy was subsequently guilty of malversation and speculation, and, absconding, left Moore responsible for a serious sum (the claim at first £6000 was after much arbitration reduced to £1000) which he had never received. While this affair was pending, he was obliged to retire into France with his wife and family—for though the office was accepted before

his marriage, its mischievous issues came upon him after. Upon the whole, there seemed a poor likelihood of his obtaining anything suitable or sufficient. His father had received from Lord Moira a trifling but for him comfortable appointment (that of barrack-master) in Dublin, but in the changes which followed he was deprived of this. Moore and his friends succeeded in obtaining for him a portion of the income by way of a retiring pension, and Moore made up the deficiency of the income out of his own pocket. It is in reference to this disappointment, which seems to have weighed heavily on his parents' spirits, that he writes the only letter of objurgation which appears in these volumes addressed home. Though a contrast in the gravity of its remonstrating tone with the cheerful, affectionate, filial letters with which these volumes abound, it is yet so sensible, so respectful, and so generous in the mode of the rebuke which it, apparently most deservedly, administers, that we are tempted to quote it.

TO HIS MOTHER.

"Jan. 26, 1815.

"My Dearest Mother,

"My father's last letter would have made us very unhappy indeed, if we had not had the pleasing thought that by that time you had received the intelligence of Lord Mulgrave's letter, and were lightened at least of *half* your sorrow; indeed, my darling mother, I am quite ashamed of the little resolution you seem to have shown upon this occurrence; it was an event *I* have been expecting for years, and which I know *you yourselves* were hourly apprehensive of; therefore, instead of looking upon it as such an overwhelming thunderclap, you ought to thank Providence for having let you enjoy it so long, and for having deferred the loss till I was in a situation (which, thank God! I am now) to keep you comfortably without it. I venture to say 'comfortably,' because I *do* think (when the expenses of that house, and the *et-ceteras* which always attend an establishment, are deducted) you will manage to live as well upon your 200*l.* a-year, as you did then upon your 350*l.*, which I suppose was the utmost the place altogether was worth. Surely, my dear mother, the stroke was just as heavy to *us* as to *you*, for I trust we have no separate interests, but share clouds and sunshine equally together; yet you would have seen no gloom in *us*—nothing like it; we instantly made up our minds to the reduction and economy that would be necessary, and felt nothing but gratitude to Heaven for being able to do so well; and this, my sweet

mother, is the temper of mind in which you should take it. If you knew the hundreds of poor clerks that have been laid low in the progress of this retrenchment that is going on, and have no means in the world of supporting their families, you would bless your lot, instead of yielding to such sinful despondency about it; for my *father's* sake (who is by no means as stout himself as he ought to be) you ought to summon up your spirits, and make the best and brightest of it.

Let him draw upon Power at two months for whatever he may want for the barrack-money, and when the rent comes due in March, we shall take care of it. Ever, my dearest mother, your own affectionate

TOM.

Long before the issue of these poor pieces of patronage had been reached, Moore had made up his mind to trust, and thankfully, to his own pen and his own industry for the support of his own family. In looking to patronage, he found nothing but disappointment.—“*Il me donne,*” he says of Lord Moira, “*des manchettes et je n’ai point de chemise,*”—and he finally dismisses all hope or at least all reliance in this quarter from his mind,

TO LADY DONEGAL.

“Tuesday, — 1812.

“I have but just time to tell you that I have at last had an interview with Lord Moira; he has fought very shy of me ever since he came here. I had heard that he had nothing left to give, the Royal Family having *put upon him* three clerks, the only remaining places of his household that he had to dispose of; so that I was well prepared for what occurred between us. He began by telling me that he ‘had not been *oblivious* of me—had not been *oblivious* of me!’ After this devil of a word, there was but little heart or soul to be expected from him. He was sorry, however, to add that all the Indian patronage he was allowed to exercise *here* was already exhausted; if, however, on his going to India, he should find anything worth my going out for, he would let me know. In the meantime, he had a right to expect that Ministers would serve his friends here in exchange for what he would do to serve their friends in India, and that he would try to get something for me through this channel. To this I replied, that ‘from *his hands* I should always be most willing to accept anything, and that perhaps it might yet be in his power to serve me; but that I begged he would not take the trouble of applying for me to the patronage of Ministers, as I would rather struggle on as I was than take anything that would have the effect of tying up my tongue under such a system as the present.’ Thus the matter rests, and such is the end of my long-cherished

hopes from the Earl of Moira, K. G. &c. He has certainly not done his duty by me : his *manner* since his appointment has been even worse than his deficiencies of *matter* ; but (except to such friends as you) I shall never complain of him. He served my father when my father much wanted it, and he and his sister took my dear Bessy by the hand most cordially and seasonably ; for all this I give him complete absolution ; and as to disappointment, I feel but little of it, as his late conduct had taught me not to rely much upon him."

One feature in the present volumes, a very pleasant one, we regret to say is fast disappearing from the biography of our times—we mean the insertion of other letters than those of the person whose life is being recorded. We must confess to a feeling of great disappointment in reference to many lives lately published, at the entire absence of the letters of correspondents. This systematic omission greatly diminishes the life and variety of such biographies. It may be difficult to select, and still more dangerous and delicate to reject. But the consequence of the entire omission of these sources of interest is, that allusions are sometimes but half understood, and the hero seems to stand solitary on the battle-field of life.

Not the least entertaining and interesting of the letters in these volumes are those from friends, especially those from Lady Donegal and her sister. The frankness, sincerity, good sense and kind feeling which pervade these epistles are very much to the credit of the writers. From these as from many other parts of the volumes most interesting and amusing extracts might be made. But no one who has any liking for Moore will fail to read them : and we shall ourselves defer any general estimate of Moore, his character or his influence, until we have the opportunity, which we shall greedily embrace, of continuing our perusal of this fascinating biography.

ART. III.—FORSTER'S PRIMÆVAL LANGUAGE.

1. *The One Primæval Language, traced experimentally through Ancient Inscriptions, including the Voice of Israel from the Rocks of Sinai.* By the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D. Part I. 1851.—Part II. *The Monuments of Egypt, and their Vestiges of Patriarchal Tradition.* 1852.
2. *Ein und zwanzig Sinaitische Inschriften. Versuch einer Erklärung.* Von Friedrich Tuch. 1849.

THE one primæval language has been an *ignis fatuus* which has led historians and philologists into many a weary and unprofitable chace. Those who engaged in it in former times had some plausible ground for expecting that the pursuit might be successful. Hebrew indeed is assumed as the language of mankind from the Creation to the Deluge; and as the origin of the principal nations of antiquity seemed to be separated only by two or three generations from the time when "all the earth was of one language and of one speech," it was a natural inference that if we only knew what was the original language of Egypt, Arabia, and Babylonia, we should find in it all the essential parts of the tongue in which Shem, Ham, and Japheth conversed with their father. With our present knowledge the problem is by no means so simple. Historical criticism rejects the supposition that great monarchies started into existence in the third generation after an event which reduced the whole human race to a single family. The zoologist declares it to have been impossible that the countless forms of animal life should have been collected in one locality or diffused from it. The ethnographer and linguist, surveying the endless variety of structure and roots in human language, from the monosyllabic Chinese to the polysynthetic Mexican, in which an oak is called *Amanganaschquiminsi*, abandons the idea of their derivation from any single stock, and regards speech as an organic development of man's intellectual and physical nature, and therefore varied by all the influences which outward circumstances exercise over him.

To Mr. Forster, however, all the discoveries of science, all the improvements in reasoning on historical subjects, go for nothing, and he writes on them as he might have done three centuries ago. He stands resolutely upon the old paths, not to see and ask where is the good way, but to denounce every other as wrong and dangerous. Availing himself of the peculiar and extreme sensibility of the public mind in this country, he calls theological prejudice to the aid of his argument, deals infidel and atheist around him, and declares that to question on any ground whatever, the historical authority, the literal fidelity, the infallible exactness even of the gospel genealogies (to suppose Heber for instance not to have been a real person, but the assumed *eponymus* of the Hebrew nation), "is to strike at the root of Christianity and Revelation." His work is written throughout under the bias which these words betray, and no one who is acquainted with the writings of those who start with the same assumption as he does, will expect sound and dispassionate argument. The sensibility to which we have alluded, however, secures him many favourable judges and a temporary reputation.

His work on the "Historical Geography of Arabia," rendered service to palæography, by making known the Himyaritic inscriptions of Hadramaut, to the interpretation of which he had been guided, by finding an account of them in an old Arabic writer. The "Voice of Israel from the Rocks of Sinai," is an attempt to read and interpret the inscriptions which are scattered through the valleys of this region, and are particularly abundant in one, which has been thence called *Wadi Mokatteb*, "the inscribed valley." They were first noticed by Cosmas*, a voyager to India in the reign of Justinian, who in a work entitled "Christian Topography," relates that some Jews who accompanied him in his travels declared them to be in Hebrew, and the work of their ancestors when they came out of Egypt, marking the dates and stages of their journey †. The publication of this work of Cosmas by

* Mr. Forster thinks he has discovered the autograph of Cosmas among the Sinaitic inscriptions, calling himself *Τιβηταυτιος*, i. e. voyager to Thibet. *Voice of Israel*, p. 4. Such a voyage would rank with the shipwreck on the coast of Bohemia.

† As Montfaucon's book is rare, and the work of Cosmas has not been printed separately, we subjoin a translation of the part which relates to the

Montfauçon, in his "*Collectio Nova Patrum*," in 1707, naturally drew the attention of scholars to them, and Clayton, the bishop of Clogher, offered 500*l.* to any one who would bring correct copies to Europe. Some were made by Dr. Pococke, and others by Mr. Wortley Montague; but it was not till Mr. F. F. Grey published, in the "*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*," in 1832, correct copies of 177, that any attempt was made to decipher them. The first who undertook this task was Professor Beer, of Leipzig, who upon the strength of the occurrence of a character resembling a cross in some of the inscriptions, concluded them to be the work of Christian pilgrims visiting the sacred places of Jewish history, and to have been made not very long before the time of Cosmas. He also supposed the people by whom they were made to be Nabathæans, distinctly guarding himself, however, against the inference that they were strictly identical with the people of Petra, to whom they must have been nearly allied from the similarity of the character in the Sinaitic inscriptions, and some found at Petra and in its neighbourhood. The evidence of the use of the cross is doubtful, and at all events applicable only to a small part of the inscriptions. In referring them to a tribe nearly allied to the Nabathæans*, Beer seems warranted by the probability of the case, since we know from

Sinaitic Inscriptions. "They (the Israelites) having received the law in writing from God, and having been recently taught letters, God, using the desert as a quiet schooling-place, suffered them for forty years to cut letters on stone. Hence you may see in that desert of Mount Sinai, at all the halting-places, all the stones thereabout, and those which have been broken off from the mountains, inscribed with Hebrew letters, as I myself testify, having travelled on foot through those regions. Some Jews who had read them told me that the writing was to this effect: 'Departure of such a one, of such a tribe, in such a year and month;' as among us people often write now at inns. The Israelites themselves, as having recently learnt to write, wrote continually, and filled so much space with their writing, that all those places are full of carved Hebrew letters, preserved even now, as I think, for the sake of the unbelieving. And any who pleases may go and see upon the spot, or inquire and learn, that I say the truth about this matter." The inscriptions are obviously not in the Hebrew character, nor do they contain dates of the removals of individuals and tribes from place to place, as no numerals appear in them. It is evident, therefore, that the Jews who gave Cosmas his information had no real knowledge on the subject.

* The ancients appear to have given the name of Nabathean to tribes which a more accurate ethnography would have called Arabian. Thus Pliny (N. H. 12, 44) calls the Troglodytes on the western shore of the Red Sea, Nabathæans.

Diodorus how extensively they traversed these deserts in their commercial pursuits, and still more by the similarity of the writing. But the vast numbers of these inscriptions, and the time and labour required for executing them, since many of them are engraven on the face of rocks which could only be approached by ladders raised from below, or baskets let down from above, indicate that they must have been the work of some who resided longer in these regions, and were better furnished with apparatus than Christian pilgrims were likely to be. We think, however, that Beer was warranted in referring them to a time not very long anterior to that of their discovery by Cosmas. There are many Greek inscriptions mixed with the others, the character and idiom of which show them to belong to an age already invaded by barbarism; and yet the condition of the surface of the stone indicates no difference in the length of time during which it has been acted upon by the atmosphere. One of these (No. 1, pl. 13, in Mr. Grey's inscriptions) is very remarkable, as it contains a Greek inscription, and also one in the unknown character, both included within a sort of frame of lines drawn on the rock, and both, according to the judgment of Mr. Grey, the work of the same hand. If this opinion be correct, and it is given by one who had no hypothesis to support, the question of their antiquity is nearly settled. Taking the widest range they cannot be older than the Christian æra, probably two or three centuries later. Besides letters the inscriptions contain, and evidently from the same hand, figures of men, horses, camels, ostriches, dogs, goats, gazelles, tortoises, lizards; in short, almost every living thing which either inhabits the Desert, or may be supposed to have been brought there by a caravan of travellers. The close resemblance of the characters of these inscriptions to the Palmyrene alphabet, whose power is generally known, must strike every palæographer, and was with sound judgment assumed by Beer as the basis of his investigations. He further, and with equal judgment, called to his aid, in deciphering them, the bilingual inscriptions, from which in the parallel cases of Phœnician and Egyptian monuments all certain knowledge has proceeded. He thus arrived at the conclusion that they contained a greeting of peace or a desire of remembrance on

the part of the individuals by whom they were inscribed, whose descent, sometimes for more than one generation, they record, according to the custom of the Semitic nations.

Beer's further progress was prevented by his death, which took place soon after the publication of the first Fasciculus of his "*Inscriptiones ad montem Sinai servatæ*," 1840. The investigation has been resumed by Tuch, professor of Theology in the University of Leipzig, in the work of which we have placed the title at the head of this article. He adopts entirely the palæographical principles of Beer, but differs from him in regard to the authors of the inscriptions, whom he considers as Pagan Arabians; and he thinks he finds in them traces of that astral and solar idolatry which we know to have prevailed among the Arabs before the rise of Islam. He attributes to them also a higher antiquity than Beer allows them, supposing them to belong to the Roman dominion in Palestine and Egypt, from the time of the Ptolemies therefore till near the age of Cosmas. It requires a profound knowledge of Syriac and Arabic to appreciate the arguments by which he proves the language to belong to the latter rather than the former dialect—seeing they are so nearly cognate. Some ancient visitors of these valleys seem to have considered them as Syriac, since they have cut upon the rocks *Cessent Syri ante Latinos Romanos*; but as they probably drew their inference from the resemblance of the character to the Palmyrene, we can lay no stress upon their opinion.

As far as we know, all competent judges have admitted the general correctness of Beer's alphabet, and thought more doubtfully of his interpretations. The author of the "*Voice of Israel from the Rocks of Sinai*," is the single exception. He has not only returned to the opinions of the Jews who told Cosmas that they are the work of their countrymen when they came out of Egypt with Moses; but has invented an alphabet and a language by means of which he reads them quite fluently, and finds in their contents a most marvellous correspondence with the Mosaic narrative. These are a few of his readings and translations. From the neighbourhood of the wells of Marah: "The people with pure mouth drinketh at the

water springs. The people at the two water springs kicketh [like] an ass, smiting with the branch of a tree the well of bitterness he heals." From the same place: "The people with pure mouth drinketh [at] the water springs together. The people [at] the two water springs kicketh like a hornet-stung ass, renitently." The miracle of the quails: "The red geese ascend from the sea; lusting the people eat on of them." Miracle of the rock of Meribah Kadesh: "The people, an ass replete with food, biteth at the waters. Moses averteth his face from him Jehovah." At the same place: "The eloquent speaker strikes the rock, flows forth the water falling down. The eloquent speaker, bowing the head, takes the rod in his hand, resounds the struck rock." The miracle of the fiery serpents: "The people sustain on a pole erecting a standard the male serpent fiery of molten brass. The people look towards the fire; bowing themselves down, sought by an evil thing, offer up vows the tribes (the Hebrews)." The battle of Rephidim: "Prayeth unto God the prophet [upon] a hard great stone [his] hands sustaining Aaron Hur."*

Now, to any one who has watched the progress of palæographical discovery, the very glibness of these wholesale translations is sufficient to condemn them. Let us take the case of the Phœnician inscriptions. From the days of Swinton and Barthelemy to the beginning of the present century, how slow and laborious was its progress, only a few legends of coins having been deciphered. Yet the difficulties to be encountered were much less than in the case of the Sinaitic inscriptions, since the affinity of the Phœnician to the Hebrew was already known, as well as the fact that the old Greek alphabet was the same as the Phœnician. But in the Sinaitic inscriptions an unknown alphabet was to be deciphered and an unknown tongue translated at the same time. The sentences, too, with which Mr. Forster presents us, are wholly unlike every species of lapidary inscription with which the world is acquainted—poetical, rhetorical, and flowing, instead of the dry, short, and matter-of-fact style which is their characteristic, and which, according to Beer's and Tuch's

* Over this inscription is a figure with uplifted hands, but Aaron and Hur are wanting.

interpretations, they actually exhibit. What was the motive with which they were engraved by the children of Israel? To record their own follies and sufferings? This is not much in accordance with the humour of that ever-rebellious race. Did Moses then cause them to be made with a prescient anticipation that they would be discovered in the sixth century of the Christian era and interpreted in the nineteenth? But the "man Moses was very meek," and especially diffident of his own powers of speech; and yet here he designates himself as "the eloquent speaker who strikes the rock."

It does not augur well of the success of a writer who undertakes to read and interpret an unknown character and an unknown tongue, that he mistakes the meaning of a very simple Latin sentence and builds an important part of his system upon his own mistake. Beer in his Dissertation, having mentioned that images of men, horses, camels, &c., are found along with the alphabetic characters, proceeds, "*Quas imagines haud ita raro difficile a literis discerni dicunt qui descripserunt. Ita factum est ut literas pro partibus imaginum, et vice versa imagines pro literarum symplegmata nonnunquam dederint;*" "whence it has happened that they" (the transcribers) "have sometimes given letters instead of parts of figures, and *vice versa* figures instead of a combination of letters." This Mr. Forster renders, "The truth is that the original writers sometimes employed *images as parts of letters*, and *vice versa images for groups of letters;*" and on the strength of this mis-translation, in which the writers are substituted for the copyers, imputes to Beer the opinion that the Sinaitic inscriptions have a pictorial or hieroglyphic character, and even speaks of it as a canon of his, that figures of men or animals frequently compose groups of letters, adding, "We may safely rest the fact of the usage upon his statement." P. 89. The application of the canon, obtained by this complete perversion of Beer's meaning, is as follows:—An inscription was wanted which should commemorate the great event of the Exodus, the passing of the Red Sea and the destruction of Pharaoh's host. Now, among the inscriptions is one containing a figure "which proved to be the rude representation or misrepresentation of a horse with his head between his fore legs in the act of running

away, while hieroglyphic horses' limbs and human limbs seemed interspersed along the whole line after the manner of Egypt on the Rosetta stone." We cannot transfer the inscription to our pages, but any one who has seen a facsimile of a stone rudely engraved with oriental characters, and noticed how they sprawl and straggle over the surface, will be aware that with a little help from the imagination, they may be made into legs or arms or almost anything you please. Of this help Mr. Forster is not sparing. To the two rude characters which he chooses to call the legs of a horse, he adds in his drawing the head, mane, body, tail, and two hind legs, and invites his readers to consider the whole as a representation of Pharaoh's horse, made in imitation of Egyptian hieroglyphic writing, by the Israelites after passing the Red Sea. A little further on he fixes on two more uncouth characters, which have no resemblance to the legs on Egyptian monuments, but which by setting upon them a body, a head, and a pair of arms, become Pharaoh returning on foot from the Red Sea, after his horse had been drowned there. This ingenious way of manufacturing evidence might be greatly extended. In Roman inscriptions it is very common to meet with *L L*, which archæologists are generally content to take for letters and read *libens libens* or *lubentissime*; but Mr. Forster has only to consider them as a pair of human legs, which they much more resemble than the characters in the Sinaitic inscription, get an artist to draw a figure upon them, and there is no knowing what curious results may be obtained.

We have already seen how careless Mr. Forster has been in rendering the passage from Beer, on which this whole doctrine of hieroglyphic figures rests. He has not dealt more fairly with the words of Cosmas, in his argument respecting the antiquity of these inscriptions. Cosmas says (see note, p. 35), that the whole region was full of Hebrew inscriptions, "preserved even now, as I think, for the sake of the unbelieving." Even to draw an inference from this as to their having had the appearance of being near 2000 years old in the time of Cosmas would not be very logical; but it is inexcusable on the strength of these words to tell the reader that Cosmas "has described the inscriptions as wearing early in the sixth century, all the

hoar marks of dilapidation consequent ordinarily upon the lapse of ages and the waste of slow natural decay." P. 27. As to the question of absolute antiquity, no one who has paid any attention to palæography will readily believe that they could have endured in a legible state for two-and-thirty centuries. Mr. Forster appeals to the Egyptian monuments, and triumphs in the admission of their high antiquity by the *savans* of the French expedition, whom in his candid and courteous phrase he designates as "the veriest revolutionary atheists." But there is no analogy in the two cases. The Egyptian inscriptions are deeply and carefully cut, not scratched or dotted on the surface like most of the Sinaitic, and above all in Upper Egypt and Nubia were not exposed to rain, which in Lower Egypt has been fatal to their durability, and must have had the same effect in Arabia.

The alphabet by which Mr. Forster reads these inscriptions has been put together on no principle but that of apparent resemblance, being compounded of Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Himyaritic, and the demotic character of Egypt, which last was not in use till the time of Psammiticus. He tells us, indeed, that inscriptions in the Sinaitic character are found in the quarries of Masara and at Philæ; but we have the authority of Lepsius for saying that this is an error, and that the inscriptions in question are in the demotic character. The language he calls Arabic, but it is not a language spoken or written in any one age or country; and even when he has called to his aid everything that can be found in an Arabic dictionary, he cannot put his readings together into any grammatical structure or arrangement, but is obliged to suppose that his primæval language "was one of those dialects which by the nearly total absence of prepositions, conjunctions, inflexions, declensions, moods, tenses, voices, prefixes, affixes, and suffixes, prove their near relationship to a common origin, the one language and one speech which obtained before the confusion of tongues at Babel." This account will only increase the reader's wonder at the ingenuity with which he has contrived, from this disjointed mass of words, to extract the well-compacted sentences of his transla-

tions, which he gives without any mark of doubt or hesitation.

The most formidable difficulty, however, remains. The children of Israel were known in Egypt as Hebrews; surely then they spoke Hebrew, and if they wrote at all, wrote Hebrew. How is it that the Sinaitic inscriptions, instead of being in the old Hebrew, that is, the Phœnician character, are in an alphabet made up from those of half a dozen nations? how is it that their language is the barbarous jargon described by Mr. Forster, instead of the Hebrew of the Pentateuch, in which, certainly, neither voices nor tenses, prepositions nor conjunctions, affixes nor suffixes, are wanting? Cosmas had given an explanation of the extraordinary multitude of the Sinaitic inscriptions; the Israelites first learned to write by the communication of the two tables, and not being apt scholars were detained in the wilderness forty years, till they had perfected themselves in the art. Having quitted Egypt in haste, and being cut off from communication with it, we may well suppose they had no stock of papyrus, and therefore used the rocks of the Desert as a sort of gigantic slates, on which to practise at once their drawing and their writing lessons. But Cosmas supposed the inscriptions to be in Hebrew, and, therefore, his hypothesis will not help an author who denies, what indeed is evident, that either the character or the language is Hebrew. Mr. Forster, however, has a resource. It is said in the eighty-first Psalm—

“ This was a statute for Israel
And a law of the God of Jacob—
This he ordained in Joseph for a testimony,
When he went out through the land of Egypt :
I heard a language I understood not.”

The sudden change of person makes it difficult to fix the connexion of the last line; it seems most probable that it is spoken in the person of Jehovah, to whom the language of Egypt, not being that of his chosen people, which the history always represents him as using, is anthropomorphically said to be barbarous and unintelligible. Mr. Forster sees in it the record of a fact never hinted at in the history, that for the purpose of insulating his

chosen people, God miraculously changed their speech at the time of the giving of the Law, from the primæval language which they had used in common with the Egyptians, to the Bible-Hebrew. Has he then suddenly gone over to the German Rationalists? and does he consider all the pure Hebrew etymologies, from the names of Adam and Eve to those of Jacob and his sons, as fictitious, and invented subsequently to the revelation of the new language made at Sinai? Were the people of Israel left to learn this language by ordinary methods? Then the cruelty of the Roman emperor who set up his edicts so high that no one could read them, and beheaded those who disobeyed them—the tyranny of the Normans who introduced French into their legislation and jurisprudence—were nothing compared with the hardship inflicted on the chosen people by having a law, guarded with the severest penalties, promulgated in a language which they did not understand. How is it that we never find them excusing themselves by the very natural and just plea of ignorance, or murmuring at a lot much more severe than the privation of the flesh-pots of Egypt? Or if the millions of the people were supernaturally inspired to speak Hebrew, how has the history been silent respecting a miracle far more stupendous than that of the manna and the quails? But it is needless to urge objections against an hypothesis which is evidently only a desperate attempt to cut a knot, in which the author has entangled himself.

The identity of the Egyptian language with that of the Sinaitic inscriptions is an essential part of Mr. Forster's system. For if Misraim, the grandson of Noah, did not introduce it into that country, it will be difficult to believe that it is the one primæval speech which his father Ham must have used; and if the Israelites brought it with them from Egypt, they must have learnt it there, being themselves of Aramæan stock. Now Mr. Forster has decided this language to be mainly Arabic; consequently there arises a necessity to prove that the old Egyptian was at once Sinaitic and Arabic; and this naturally brings us to the second part of his work, the *Monuments of Egypt*, and their Vestiges of Patriarchal Tradition. If we implicitly take his statement, we have historical evidence of the original population of Egypt being derived from

Arabia, which of course would be a presumption that the language was radically Arabic. But we have learnt not to put implicit faith in his statements, and to look narrowly to his authorities, and we find this, the fundamental fact of his theory, as applied to Egypt, to have no basis but mistranslation. Juba, he tells us, a writer of great authority among the ancients, states that Egypt was originally peopled from Arabia, whence he infers that the old Arabic stands identified, historically as well as philologically, with the ancient Egyptian. The words of Juba, as quoted by Pliny (N. H. 36, 34), are, "Juba tradit accolas Nili, a Syene, non Ethiopum populos sed Arabum esse dixit, usque Meroe." That Mr. Forster, who cites this passage, should have overlooked the circumstance that *no part of Egypt lies between Syene and Meroe*, can only be explained by the blind haste with which men rush to claim evidence in support of foregone conclusions. Had Juba even made such an assertion respecting the country bordering on the Egyptian Nile in his own days (he lived near the Christian æra), what evidence would that have afforded of the origin of the Egyptian population in the second century after the Flood? So much for the historical identification of the old Arabic with the ancient Egyptian. The philological will not be found to proceed more successfully.

There are two sources whence a knowledge of the Egyptian language may be derived. One is the remains of the Coptic, which appears from many coincidences with notices in ancient authors, to be the same which they called Egyptian. These remains have long been considerable, and have been recently augmented by the researches which our Government enabled Dr. Tattam to make in Egypt. They have led all recent Coptic scholars to the conclusion that the language has nothing in common with the Semitic family, except a few words borrowed from the Hebrew and the Arabic. To this conclusion, which is fatal to his theory respecting the one primæval language, Mr. Forster has nothing to oppose but his own confident denial and the opinions of some learned men who lived when the Coptic was little known. The discoveries in hieroglyphical literature have added an immense weight of evidence to the proof

previously existing. They have shown that the Coptic was in the main the language of Egypt as far back as its monuments extend, corresponding in roots and grammatical structure with the literary remains still existing. What was left then for Mr. Forster, in order to prove the identity of his Primæval language with the old Egyptian? Nothing less could avail him than to deny the truth of the whole system of hieroglyphical interpretation, read the monuments of Egypt by his Sinaitic alphabet, and translate them by his Sinaitic vocabulary. According to him, not only is the alleged discovery of the phonetic value of the hieroglyphics a delusion, but the whole school of Champollionists are enemies of revealed religion; who impugn the truth of the Mosaic records, and even the Gospel history, and against whom it is necessary to make an appeal to the English public and the Christian world. The readers of this Journal are not uninformed respecting the evidence on which the discoveries of the school in question were founded. They began from the only safe starting point, a bilingual inscription; they were carried on by slow and cautious induction from the interpretation of the names of Ptolemy and Cleopatra to those of other Macedonian sovereigns, from these to the Roman emperors, and from these again backward to the Pharaohs in the remotest ages of the Monarchy. The charge of rashness and superficiality against the eminent men by whose labours this system has been established, comes with a singularly bad grace from Mr. Forster, of whose carelessness in alleging evidence and reasoning upon it, we have already exhibited such proofs. His knowledge of the system is very slight, and his objections to the process by which it has been established would apply with tenfold force to every supposed discovery of his own. In its first stage it was an experiment, as every attempt at deciphering must be, but confirmed as it has been by success in subsequent stages, by collateral evidence, and especially by correspondence with the lists of Manetho, it is no longer a conjecture.

Having denied altogether the soundness of Champollion's discovery, that figures in the cartouches of kings stand for letters, or, indeed, that the cartouches contain names of kings at all, Mr. Forster gives us his own inter-

pretation of them. According to him the figures stand for the objects denoted by them—a lion for a lion, a hawk for a hawk, and a goose for a goose, and the characters which are not pictorial are to be read by his Sinaitic alphabet. How little, however, he knows of the phonetic system, which he summarily sets aside, is evident from a ludicrous error into which he has fallen. The two volumes of the "Gallery of Egyptian Antiquities in the British Museum" have each an emblematic title-page, *composed* by the practised pencil of Mr. Bonomi. These Mr. Forster has been at the pains to copy and exhibit among the evidences of his doctrines, supposing them apparently to be genuine remains, though they contain an inscription in hieroglyphic characters and Pharaonic style, *FOURTH YEAR OF THE BENEFICENT LADY VICTORIA, DAUGHTER OF THE SUN, RULING THE WAVES*.* The following are some of the results of his method of explaining the cartouches of the Egyptian sovereigns:—That of Ptolemy, instead of *Ptolemaios* as read by Young and Champollion, becomes "the lion stretching out the paw rushing on one unawares;" Cleopatra, "the lion assailing, rushing upon, wounding or breaking the head." The most remarkable, and that which we think will satisfy our readers as to the value of his discoveries, is the cartouche of Amun-meï Rameses, which signifies according to him, "A stupid goose scolds." Zoologists are sometimes at a loss to identify animals by ancient descriptions, and may be thankful for this evidence that the *vulpanser* of Egypt corresponded exactly, in understanding and good manners, with the inhabitant of our farm-yards and commons. Yet we cannot but wonder that the wise Egyptians should have put this record not under the figure of the goose, which occurs frequently in their paintings, but in everlasting granite on their temples and palaces.

The main purpose for which Mr. Forster has undertaken to demolish the system of Young and Champollion, is by

* The discovery which Mr. Forster supposes himself to have made from this title-page, of the Egyptian name of the basilisk, as confirmatory of his alphabet, is only another proof of his limited knowledge of Egyptian antiquities. The group of characters which he reads *sil kum*, "the basilisk stands erect," belongs not to the basilisk, but to the composite figure of a disk, vulture's wings and a basilisk, the emblem of the Horus of Apollinopolis. It is found over the head of this god, where no basilisk appears, and never with the basilisk alone.

means of his own interpretations of Egyptian monuments to show, that vestiges of patriarchal tradition were preserved among them. Our readers will perhaps be surprised to find that the resurrection of the body is one of these, and that a disclosure of it is contained on the wooden covering of the mummy of Mycerinus or Menkare, in the British Museum. He thus comments upon it:—

“Observing below the wild ass an hieroglyphic which I mistook for a sweeping falcon, only the head appeared shapeless, I examined the word appended to it which read *adzim*. Not having met with it before, I consulted the Lexicon, and found in Treytag, *adzam*, ‘os radixve caudæ equinæ,’ and in Richardson *adzam*, ‘the rumpbone or root of the tail of a mare.’ Unenlightened by the definition, I returned to the plate; when to my great surprise I saw at once that the supposed hawk had every appearance of being some kind of bone. A surgical friend being at hand, I showed him the hieroglyphic, which he immediately pronounced to be the *os coccygis* or *crupper bone*. By the kindness of a trustee, I had subsequently the opportunity of examining this hieroglyphic upon the coffin lid of Mycerinus: when it proved to be the *crupper bone*, most perfectly delineated, so that it could not possibly be mistaken for a bird or for anything but what it is. This discovery recalled to my recollection the Mahometan doctrine concerning the resurrection, and the singular tenet inculcated by Mahomet in the Koran, that the *crupper bone* was the only part which should survive the decay of the body, as a nucleus round which the other parts were to gather in the day of the Resurrection. (Sale, Preliminary Diss. i. 104.) How wonderful that a notion seemingly so strange, and very naturally supposed to originate with the arch-impostor, or at farthest with the Jewish Rabbis, should have existed nearly 3000 years before in *heathen* Egypt, and be found, after the lapse of 4000 years, engraven on the coffin-lid of one of the earliest Pharaohs.”—P. ii. p. 62.

It is true that in Mr. Forster’s drawing, the character in question has some resemblance to the *os coccygis*; but it has none at all in the engraving of the mummy case of Mycerinus in Colonel Vyse’s work (2, 94). Were it a *crupper bone*, what a leap to the doctrine of the resurrection! The group of characters which our author supposes to be the name of Mycerinus is that which belongs to the goddess Netpe, and is found in hundreds of instances, with which Mycerinus can have nothing to do.

Waiving the question in what part of the Pentateuch

the resurrection of the body is taught, we would ask, what advantage an advocate of Divine Revelation can propose to his cause, by showing that its most peculiar doctrines were known to the Egyptians? When the sublime theology and the wise legislation of Moses is urged as a proof of the divine origin of Judaism, the answer is ready, he borrowed them from the Egyptians. Mr. Forster plays into the hands of these objectors, and concedes to them more than they had thought of claiming. His indiscretion resembles that of the injudicious advocates for the doctrine of the Trinity, who by tracing it among so many Heathen nations abundantly explain its appearance as a corruption of Christianity. Besides the doctrine of the Resurrection, he finds in the Egyptian monuments Satan, designated as a roaring lion, the Tree of Life, identified as a pomegranate, the Temptation and the Fall.

Had Mr. Forster merely failed in his attempt to solve a difficult historical problem, we should have passed a much less severe criticism upon his work. But the tone of arrogance and bigotry by which it is disfigured, rendered it desirable to show how superficial is his knowledge and how inconsequential his reasoning. There is a want of moral courage among the critics of our country, when they give an account to the public of works which are likely to be favourites with those who call themselves the religious world. They are fearful of bringing on themselves the imputation of irreligion by freely exposing their faults; the praise they bestow is circulated far and wide by the puffing publisher, and a false reputation is created for their authors. It becomes a duty, therefore, for writers who are not subject to these influences to speak plainly, and as Mr. Forster's appears to us to be decidedly one of these false reputations, we have not hesitated to say so, and to assign our reasons.

ART. IV.—PHAETHON.

Phaethon: or, Loose Thoughts for Loose Thinkers. By Rev. Charles Kingsley, Canon of Middleham and Rector of Eversley. Macmillan. 1852.

WE have few greater teachers than Mr. Kingsley; yet none more certain to go astray the moment he becomes didactic. The truths which move him most he reads off at a glance; and the attempt to exhibit them to others as the result of intellectual elaboration naturally fails. His genius is altogether that of the artist, for the apprehension of concrete reality, not that of the philosopher, for finding in thought the grounds and connexions of what he perceives. With rare qualifications for seeing, feeling, and believing right, were he to abstain from reasoning, he would not often be wrong. No living writer brings a quicker eye to catch the looks of nature, a humaner heart to interpret the tragedy of life, a devouter faith to hope for the good while contending with the ill. His descriptive passages have the very smell of a new-ploughed field: his insight into the secret sorrows of a sceptic and selfish age is evidently caught through the manly tears of pity and not by the dry stare of inquisitorial suspicion: and his aspirations after a nobler and juster society,—however ill-defended from objection,—are clearly the product of a healthful reverence for human nature and trust in the Living God. The very faults which attach to his productions as works of art arise from the intensity of his moral convictions and the obtrusiveness of generous sympathy, rushing in to disturb the dramatic impartiality of his representations. His ideal world,—the type of character he loves, the spirit of life he sighs to create, the religious faiths to which he clings,—we seldom find to be without deep truth and beauty: the admirations and aversions he awakens are essentially wholesome and ennobling; and if he errs, it is in fitting them on amiss to actual classes and persons little known to him by direct experience. True alike in direct observation and in pure conception, he is apt to mistake in the mixed region of

half-seen realities, where vision gives but the outline and the colouring is filled in by thought. Towards the object painted he teaches you to direct the right feeling, be it of love or hate; but when he borrows his names from actual men and things, he sometimes labels the object wrong, and so misdirects the favour or disfavour of his readers towards the personages of the present or the past. Whatever his impulsive nature seizes on as odious on *any* account, is liable, if discerned in the obscurity of distance, to appear to him odious on *all* accounts: and he accumulates accusations upon it which have no congruity with one another, and constructs defences against it which miss the path of its approach.

This combination of just and clear feeling with unjust and confused polemic is curiously exemplified in Mr. Kingsley's *Phaethon*. In this little book, which borrows its form from the Dialogue of the Academy, the author applies his reverence for Socrates and imitation of Plato to express his abhorrence of Emerson. More charming painting and more miserable reasoning, better dialogue and worse dialectic, so strong a flavour of good English sentiment and so faint a trace of any Hellenic thought, it would be difficult to find within the compass of a hundred pages professing to take their inspiration from the schools of Athens. Plato is a dangerous master to men in whom a fervid genius has not been tempered by the severest discipline. His infinite fascination depends, like the charm of all great works of Grecian art, on the blending and balance in one grand whole of the chief elements of strength and beauty: and it is vain for any mind of partial faculty, however genuine, to attempt the same effects. With some approach to him in power of portraiture, in graceful dialogue, in religious depth, in pregnant irony, Mr. Kingsley has nothing in common with his speculative subtlety and his systematising symmetry and grasp. The consequence in the present volume is an unhappy caricature of the most questionable features of the Platonic method; introduced by a delightful English prelude where no Socrates is wanted, and followed by a deep-hearted English conversation when he is gone. Whatever persuasive power the volume may have resides, we venture to say, wholly in these passages of mere delineation, and

is only impaired by the intermediate tissue of ambiguities and sophisms.

The theme of the book is professedly the tendency of Emerson's philosophy; and especially the doctrine that, as long as men sincerely speak and live by the faith they have, its relation to absolute truth is a matter, if not of indifference, at least of no practical concern. The scene is laid in the park of a Herefordshire gentleman, Templeton by name; at whose dinner-table the topic has already been discussed, the day before the opening of the piece, on occasion of a visit to the hall of one Professor Windrush, an American prophet of the "spiritual school." The party gathered around the table had been such as to draw out all the points of the controversy. The hostess, Lady Jane Templeton, a refined and saintly evangelical, having retired with the ladies to the drawing-room, there were left a blundering High-Church curate, who was no match for the transcendentalist; Templeton himself, offended by the Professor's rudeness and irreverence, but intellectually in sympathy with his doctrines; and a clerical friend and former college companion of Templeton's, who evidently represents Mr. Kingsley's own sentiments, Socratically defending the Catholic creeds, and who appears in the first person through the volume, as narrator of the whole. Of this party only the last two—the host and the philosophical clergyman—are personally brought upon the scene. The colloquy is between them alone. On the morning after the Windrush visit, we find them on the bank of the park stream, with fishing-rod in hand, but with the oppression of yesterday's controversy so heavy on their minds, that the chances of sport pass unheeded by; and on the old keeper's venturing, as he strolled by, to twit them with their awkwardness, they find out that their thoughts are running on the same matter; and the clergyman confesses that he has been sitting up all night, writing a Platonic dialogue in exposure of the Professor's heresies. The manuscript is in his pocket; and as, in their present humour, they prefer philosophy to fish, it is produced and read as they sit upon the grass. To the hour and the spot of this piece of out-door dialectic we are brought by the following delicate sketch from nature:—

"Templeton and I were lounging by the clear limestone stream which crossed his park, and wound away round wooded hills toward the distant Severn. A lovelier fishing morning sportsman never saw. A soft grey under-roof of cloud slid on before a soft west wind, and here and there a stray gleam of sunlight shot into the vale across the purple mountain-tops, and awoke into busy life the denizens of the water, already quickened by the mysterious electric influences of the last night's thunder-shower. The long-winged cinnamon-flies spun and fluttered over the pools; the sand-bees hummed merrily round their burrows in the marly bank; and delicate iridescent ephemerae rose by hundreds from the depths, and dropping their shells, floated away, each a tiny Venus Anadyomene, down the glassy ripples of the reaches. Every moment a heavy splash beneath some over-hanging tuft of milfoil or water-hemlock, proclaimed the death-doom of a hapless beetle, who had dropped into the stream beneath; yet still we fished, and fished, and caught nothing, and seemed utterly careless about catching anything; till the old keeper who followed us, sighing and shrugging his shoulders, broke forth into open remonstrance."—P. 1.

The figure of Professor Windrush is skilfully brought out, touch after touch, by the preliminary conversation of the two companions. Many of the separate strokes are capital, and place before us to the life one phase or other of the modern American free-thinker. The curiosity of the republican traveller, avowed on presenting his letters of introduction, to witness "the inner hearth-life of the English landed aristocracy;" the petting he has enjoyed at Manchester from the local *illuminati* and *-tæ* to whom every sceptic is a hero; his worship of the "glorious nineteenth century," and contempt for more elderly beliefs; the credulous expenditure of his unemployed faculty of wonder and zeal on mesmerisms, electro-biologies, loves of the plants, and vegetarianisms; the thaumaturgic cant which talks of the spiritual world as if it were within the sphere of sense, and then balances the account by "spiriting" the material away into a fanciful mythology; his neutral admiration of all well-marked specimens of any sort of man; his faith, not so much in the unity of "the Deity," as in the non-Trinity of *it*; present us with a series of features, not one of which can fail of recognition by observers familiar with the mental pathology of the newest time and the youngest nation. But by uniting them all in one person, and giving them as the characteristics of one

"school," Mr. Kingsley has produced a confused and inconceivable picture: and by attaching to this picture at one time the name of Emerson, at another that of Parker, and then an allusion to Francis Newman, he commits a practical injustice. To make each of these writers responsible for the theories of the others, and all of them for the superstitions of magnetists, ascetics, and magicians, is at once a fallacy and an injury. Our author adopts the prevalent fashion of including them all under the name of "spiritualists:" but if this word expresses, as we suppose, a belief in the soul's apprehension of divine truth by immediate communion with God rather than by external media, it not only includes Mr. Kingsley himself, but denotes the very doctrine which his Platonic dialogue is written to uphold. The practice of classing all persons together who agree in their negative attitude towards the historical Scriptures is not surprising among the mere populace of Christendom: to them there are no differences discernible beyond their own circle: Protagoras and Parmenides, Plato and Hippias, Zeno and Epicurus,—nay, Proclus and Mohammed,—are all simply "heathens" alike. But such indiscrimination is without excuse in a scholar and a divine: nor can we understand how any one whose creed is wide enough to take Socrates as a proper type of method in religious thought, and who knows how to oppose him to the sophists and atheists of his day, can refuse to feel the presence of a deep and noble religion in Theodore Parker and Francis Newman, or can condescend to suppress the contrast which separates them from Emerson. It would be difficult to find two living writers more diametrically opposed to one another in their whole mode of thought and feeling, in the structure of their beliefs, in the tendency of their lives, than Emerson and Parker: and equally difficult to find two men more alike in the roots of their faith and character than Kingsley and Parker. The English rector and the Boston preacher are nothing less, we do believe, than twin-brothers in the eye of reality: their intense moral convictions, their impatient social compassions and indignations, their eloquent dogmatism, their deep trust in a Holy God and his everliving inspiration, their aversion to the sublime neutrality of our modern nature-worship, their reverence for the immortal capacities

of the soul, mark them out as not far apart in the invisible church; indeed, as joint prophets set to rebuke all despair of divine truth and indifferentism to human duty. Listening more to his ecclesiastical antipathies than to his natural sympathies, Mr. Kingsley has put into one category,—because they are all outside the “Catholic creeds,”—persons whose whole bases and development of belief are entirely different from one another. The consequence is, that he has set before himself and his readers no one clear form of heresy or unbelief for refutation. The proposition which he chiefly attacks is the characteristic of no nameable school; is expressed in language vaguely figurative; and exposed in arguments which play with the metaphor employed, and evade the reality concealed. That proposition, attributed to Windrush, is thus introduced by the clergyman, in his conversation with Templeton:—

“Do you think, moreover, that the theory which he so boldly started, when his nerves and his manners were relieved from the unwonted pressure by Lady Jane and the ladies going up stairs, was part of the same old foundation?”

“Which, then?”

“*That, if a man does but believe a thing, he has a right to speak it and act on it, right or wrong?* Have you forgotten his vindication of your friend, the radical voter, and his “spirit of truth?””

“What, the worthy who, when I canvassed him as the liberal candidate for —, and promised to support freedom of religious opinion, tested me by breaking out into such blasphemous ribaldry as made me run out of the house, and then went up and voted against me as a bigot?”

“I mean him, of course. The Professor really seemed to admire the man, as a more brave and conscientious hero than himself. I am not squeamish, as you know, but I am afraid that I was quite rude to him when he went as far as that.”

“What, when you told him that you thought that, after all, the old theory of the divine right of kings was as plausible as the new theory of the Divine Right of Blasphemy? My dear fellow, do not fret yourself on that point. He seemed to take it rather as a compliment to his own audacity, and whispered to me that “The Divine Right of Blasphemy” was an expression of which Theodore Parker himself need not have been ashamed.”

“He was pleased to be complimentary. But, tell me, what was it in his oratory which has so vexed the soul of the country squire?”

“That very argument of his, among many things. I saw, or

rather felt, that he was wrong; and yet, as I have said already, I could not answer him; and, had he not been my guest, should have got thoroughly cross with him as a *pis aller*.'

" 'I saw it. But, my friend, used we not to read Plato together, and enjoy him together, in old Cambridge days? Do you not think that Socrates might at all events have driven the Professor into a corner?'

" 'He might; but I cannot. Is that, then, what you were writing about all last night?'

" 'It was.'—P. 14.

According to this statement, the question which the Dialogue undertakes to solve is a purely ethical question, 'Whether a man ought to *speak out unconditionally his own sincere convictions*; or whether such duty is *contingent on his convictions being absolutely true*.'

Whoever maintains the latter is bound to produce a test whereby we may distinguish absolute truth from relative certitude: otherwise he leaves the duty of veracious profession subject to an impossible condition, and condemns it never to appear. With this fatal omission Mr. Kingsley's Socrates is chargeable.

To maintain the former, we need not assume that absolute truth is unattainable or unimportant, and say that, provided we get a faithful picture of men's thought, it is of no consequence whether their thought be a correct image of reality. On the contrary, those who affirm that there is, at all events, a good in veracious profession, do so, not simply from the moral instinct of ingenuousness, but also with a view to the ulterior good of realised truth; regarding the comparison of conceptions as the appointed prelude to the command of facts. The opinion which is thus directly expressive of a *hope* of truth, is made, by Mr. Kingsley's Protagoras, to imply a total *despair* of it, and an utter *indifference* to it.

The question is not helped forward to solution by showing that mischiefs are attendant on the belief, and therefore on the propagation, of error. Good also attends on the belief, and therefore on the propagation, of truth. 'Sincere convictions' are, to their possessor, identical with truth: did he withhold them from fear of doing mischief, he would either treat them as false,—which contradicts their sincerity; or would assume truth to be hurtful,—which is the meanest atheism.

Nor, finally, do we gain any light for our problem by being told, that there are times and places unsuitable for the divulging of certain thoughts, however sincerely entertained. There is no human duty that may not be similarly misplaced, and that has not to be assigned to its proper season by the exercise of moral tact and judgment. If you think a man a fool, you are not to go and tell him so: but if your best friend proposes to take him into partnership and asks your opinion of him, you are bound to speak your mind. It is not that there are any supposed truths intrinsically unfit to be uttered; but that there are none that may not be abusively dislocated by passion and imprudence.

Yet these irrelevant positions are the only ones which Mr. Kingsley's dialectic even attempts to make good against the doctrine of ingenuous unreserve. Thus his *Thesis* (1.) extinguishes the obligation of intellectual veracity by submitting it to an impossible condition, (2.) attributes to his opponents a scepticism (as to the accessibility of truth) with which their opinion could not coexist. And his *Argument* shows only, what nobody denies, viz. (1.) the invariable hurtfulness of believed error; and (2.) the occasional unseasonableness of spoken truth.

The scene opens with the arrival at the Pnyx of the young Alcibiades and Phaethon, and the discovery of Socrates, standing with his face towards the rising sun, rapt in prayer for light to see the truth, in whatever matters might be discussed there that day. Alcibiades and his companion had been discussing, on their way, a yesterday's lecture of Protagoras, the doctrine of which they thus describe to Socrates.

"Truth was what each man troweth, or believeth to be true. 'So that,' he said, 'one thing is true to me, if I believe it true, and another opposite thing to you, if you believe that opposite. For,' continued he, 'there is an objective and a subjective truth; the former, doubtless, one and absolute, and contained in the nature of each thing; but the other manifold and relative, varying with the faculties of each perceiver thereof. But as each man's faculties,' he said, 'were different from his neighbour's, and all more or less imperfect, it was impossible that the absolute objective truth of anything could be seen by any mortal, but only some partial approximation, and, as it were, sketch of it, according as the object

was represented with more or less refraction on the mirror of his subjectivity. And therefore, as the true inquirer deals only with the possible, and lets the impossible go, it was the business of the wise man, shunning the search after absolute truth as an impious attempt of the Titans to scale Olympus, to busy himself humbly and practically with subjective truth, and with those methods—rhetoric, for instance,—by which he can make the subjective opinions of others either similar to his own, or, leaving them as they are,—for it may be very often unnecessary to change them,—useful to his own ends.’”—P.19.

It is perhaps too much to expect that our author, any more than the historical novelists, should bind his fiction by any close fidelity to fact. Having set himself to find, within the Athens of the Socratic age, a true sample of the New England Emersonian, he may have been obliged to put up with Protagoras, as the best-matching sophist that could be had. But we fear that the Protagoras of the Theætetus would hardly know himself again in the disguise of the Phaethon. The principle of his scepticism,—indeed of the whole Hellenic logic,—is mis-stated here, and confounded with a modern doctrine essentially different. ‘The *subjective* is all that we can attain; and it affords no certain clue to lead us to the *objective*,’—is the maxim of modern Idealism, and of the Critical Philosophy on its speculative side. ‘The *phenomenal* is all that comes before us; and thence no bridge can be found to conduct us to the *real*,’—was the position of the sophistic school of Athens. The antithesis expressed by the words ‘subject’ and ‘object,’ with all the problems involved in it, was latent in the Greek schools; and there prevailed instead another antithesis, partly indeed concurring with the former but crossing it at various points,—expressed by the words *γιννόμενα* and *ὄντα*. The charge against human knowledge was not, that one man’s faculties reported differently from another’s, so as to exhibit subjective discrepancies; nor that, however accordant with itself, it was still all a subjective affair, without any objective guarantee;—but that the universe being but the perpetual genesis and flow of phenomena, there *were* no fixed realities to be known. This principle was borrowed from Heraclitus: but he had resolved only the external world into the procession of eternal change, and had left to the mind at least

the power of knowing *phenomena*. Protagoras advanced a step further: extending the rule to man as well as the rest of nature, he contended that the percipient not less than the perceived, the active as well as the passive condition of perception, was liable to the law of Heraclitus; and that what we call external phenomena are but the product of a relation between two transiencies, without any constant term. Apart from sight there is no colour; apart from hearing, no sound; and where there is no perception, there is no phenomenon, and therefore nothing. This is the meaning of his celebrated maxim that 'Man is the measure of all things:' phenomena requiring his senses as their condition; and existence being at zero where phenomena are not. When therefore our author makes Protagoras say that 'there is an objective truth,' which is 'doubtless one and absolute, contained in the nature of each thing,' the statement is at variance with the fundamental doctrine of his system. The search after this 'absolute truth,' so far from appearing to him an 'impious attempt' to reach a reality too divine for us, was the mere futile grasp of a dreamer at a non-existence. And hence, the limitation of ourselves to phenomena was no humble surrender of impossible though desirable attainments,—no acquiescence in necessary ignorance;—but a positive converse with the only things there were. It was therefore, in his view, not an ignorance, but a knowledge; and error, not truth, was the condition unattributable to thought. His maxim was that '*All thought is knowledge,*' and the contrary proposition, that '*No thought is knowledge*' belongs not to him, but to Gorgias. We quite admit the *moral* equivalence of the two positions: but their logical derivation is different: and the affinity of both with the Emersonian tendency too slight to justify the representative function which Mr. Kingsley has assigned to them.

Waiving however all historical niceties, and taking the doctrine as it is set up for attack, we are afraid that our author's dialectic weapons fly all round it without so much as grazing it at all. The first stage of the argument brings us to the conclusion that it is possible, and hurtful, to believe what is false; a proposition which Mr. Kingsley's Protagoras has not the least interest in denying, and

does indeed *ipso facto* admit, when at the outset he allows an objective reality, and complains that men, who cannot *know* it, will yet *think* about it. Nor would the genuine Protagoras question for a moment the *hurtfulness* of such a δόξα as the following sentences amusingly describe :—

“ *Socrates*. ‘Therefore if a thing subjectively true be also objectively false, it does not exist, and is nothing.’

“ ‘It is so,’ said I.

“ *Socrates*. ‘Let us, then, let nothing go its own way, while we go on ours with that which is only objectively true, lest coming to a river over which it is subjectively true to us that there is a bridge, and trying to walk over that work of our own minds, but no one’s hands, the bridge prove to be objectively false, and we, walking over the bank into the water, be set free from that which is subjective on the further bank of the Styx.’

“ Then I, laughing, ‘This hardly coincides, Alcibiades, with Protagoras’s opinion, that subjective truth was alone useful.’

“ ‘But rather proves,’ said *Socrates*, ‘that undiluted draughts of it are of a hurtful and poisonous nature, and require to be tempered with somewhat of objective truth, before it is safe to use them ;—at least in the case of bridges.’ ”—P. 25.

In the *Theætetus* (166, C.—167, C.) Protagoras is made to explain his mode of dealing with just such cases as these. He allows fully that the opinions of men may widely differ from one another in utility or hurtfulness, in healthy or morbid character, in wisdom or folly : that none is so skilled as the physician in relation to animal life, or as the farmer in relation to vegetable growth. Mr. Kingsley’s ideal bridge he would simply call a *πονηρὰ αἰσθησις* ; and instead of being bound to uphold it, as if nothing subjective could come amiss, would condemn it precisely and solely on the ground of its mischievousness. Having flung away the test of anterior objective reality, he was forced all the more to that of consequent injury or good. True, no thought could, in his phraseology, be other than *knowledge*. But within this comprehensive category he made room for the better and the worse, the salutary and the pernicious : his effigy would have been the fittest vignette for the publications of the *Useful Knowledge Society* : and should the loquacious shades of Protagoras and Lord Brougham ever meet, a little rhetoric may be naturally

exchanged in claiming the preconception of that renowned association.

The next stage of the discussion is occupied in extending to things moral and religious the allegation now admitted in reference to things physical,—viz., that error is mischievous, and carries in it painful consequences, not from the anger of any offended being, but from the jarring relations in which it places us with the real nature of things. Just as a mistake in arithmetic spoils our accounts and is felt within our purse; in music, creates dissonance instead of harmony; in the reading of human character, places us at the mercy of a knave:—so must every false interpretation of the Cause of Causes, the Legislator of Law, bring men into discordance with the primary thought and purpose of the universe, involving the loss of needful help or the dangers of vain reliance. Towards an Infinite Being, moreover, all errors must be errors of defect: and he who falls into them lives as if under a rule less just and holy than that which really embraces him;—a mistake operating in the worst direction, and, as measured by the greatness of its object, little less than infinite in its amount and in its misery.

“As if, for instance, a man believing that Zeus loves him less than He really does, should become superstitious and self-tormenting. Or, believing that Zeus will guide him less than He really will, he should go his own way through life without looking for that guidance: or if, believing that Zeus cares about his conquering his passions less than He really does, he should become careless and despairing in the struggle: or if, believing that Zeus is less interested in the welfare of mankind than He really is, he should himself neglect to assist them, and so lose the glory of being called a benefactor of his country: would not all these mistakes be hurtful ones?”

“Certainly,” said I: but Alcibiades was silent.

“S. ‘And would not these mistakes, by the hypothesis, themselves punish him who made them, without any resentment whatsoever, or Nemesis of the gods, being required for his chastisement?’”

“It seems so,” said I.

“S. ‘But can we say of such mistakes, and of the harm which may accrue from them, anything but that they must both be infinite; seeing that they are mistakes concerning an infinite Being, and his infinite properties, on every one of which, and on all together, our daily existence depends?’”

"P. 'It seems so.'

"S. 'So that, until such a man's error concerning Zeus, the source of all things, is cleared up, either in this life or in some future one, we cannot but fear for him infinite confusion, misery, and harm, in all matters which he may take in hand.'"—P. 32.

No deeper truth can there be than this; and no nobler statement of it. It has a tone in it of Plato's voice; touched by which, we find it hard to listen to the scruples of criticism, begging us to explain the logical relevancy of this reflection to the main argument. Yet what would our Socrates have us to do? Granted, all error is mischievous; religious error, transcendently so: what then? do you say, that we must not make ourselves parties to the mischief, by propagating error? We have no intention to do so; no man ever had: when we utter our convictions, it is in *resistance* to error; and the more you persuade us of its mischief, the more must we be impelled to speak. 'Hitherto' (might a Phaeton and Alcibiades say) 'we have always found, in the evils of human ignorance and mistake, the strongest reason for endeavouring to correct them according to our light, and contributing whatever better word seemed given us to say: and though it was not hidden from us that we too might possibly be wrong, yet whether it were so there appeared no better way to tell than by submitting our thought to the great dialectic of the world. For in consorting with you, O Socrates, we have experienced the following thing: We have come to you with a secret opinion on some matter,—perhaps about justice, or beauty, or the gods,—which seemed to us right, and which we had never fetched out of the silent part of us, so that we or anybody else could hear it. And when we were asking you about quite a different thing,—it might be geometry or music,—you have somehow caused us to confess in words this secret opinion, and have put to us many questions with regard to it, so that we could not help seeing whether it agreed or disagreed with other things which also appeared certain. At the end of our talk we have been ashamed to find how little true and noble was the opinion which we had supposed so good: and we are afraid we should never have discovered this, had you not made us *speak* our thought and hear about it: for so long as it lay still, it had a comely

look; and was like a person who when asleep indeed appears beautiful, but on opening his eyes and getting up, is found to squint and hobble. How then is it, O Socrates, that your maieutic art consists in making us, even against our will, openly *speak out* our errors, and so become free from them; and yet now you advise us, of our own resolve, "to hold our tongue about them?"

In short, when the inquirer has spared no honest endeavours to see things as they are, there are but two inferences open to him from his contemplation of the mischiefs of mistake. He must either say everything, in hope that it may be truth; or say nothing, for fear it should be error. To do the last is to hold, in relation to his belief, the attitude of unbelief; to presume the falsehood of all thought; to behave towards his own truth as if it were nature's lie; to act therefore on the postulate, that the human faculties are instruments of delusion: and what is this but the ultimate stage of the most pestilent scepticism? To do the former is to protest against the despair of truth; to assume it to be attainable, and to love it as the best; to trust in the power of reality to get the better of semblance and work its current on by the insensible abrasion of ignorance and obstinacy; to live in the faith that the mind of man is capable of veracious correspondence with the facts of God: and what is this, but a healthy and devout persuasion, the common basis of philosophy and religion? Between these extreme courses, there is no intermediate; unless Mr. Kingsley will show us how we can be simultaneously conscious and unconscious of mistake in what we hold; retaining it in thought from presumption of its truth; suppressing it in speech from consternation at its error.

Whether our author himself was, up to this point, quite convinced by his own reasoning, we cannot but feel some doubt: for in the next and third stage of the argument his dialectic assumes a termagant character; he loses all logical count; and scolds at the human impulse to utter ingenuously what is believed sincerely, as a propensity absolutely brutish. The discussion here becomes purely *ethical*, respecting the value of a certain inner spring of action, viz. "*the spirit of truth*," which is defined as the feeling which leads a man to "*say honestly what he believes*."

In order to strip this "spirit" of all moral character, Mr. Kingsley begins by supposing it to say *dishonestly* what it does *not* believe; after which ingenious tack, there is nothing but plain sailing to the end of the argument. Whether Alcibiades or Socrates be the greater simpleton, in the following outset of the discussion, let the reader judge:—

"*Alcibiades.* 'I assert, that whosoever says honestly what he believes, does so by the spirit of truth.'

"*Socrates.* 'Then if Lyce, patting those soft cheeks of yours, were to say, "Alcibiades, thou art the fairest youth in Athens," she would speak by the spirit of truth?'

"*Alcibiades.* 'They say so.'

"*Socrates.* 'And they say rightly. But if Lyce, as is her custom, *wished by so saying to cheat you into believing that she loved you* and thereby to wheedle you out of a new shawl, she would still speak by the spirit of truth?'

"*Alcibiades.* 'I suppose so.'"—P. 35.

Lyce's sly ways having passed muster as examples of "honest belief," the counsel who had appealed with success to this audacious illustration has it all his own way: and the "spirit of truth" is speedily and opprobriously put out of court; not however without further damage from confused and calumnious fallacies. To illustrate its temper, the case is put, of a person gratuitously proclaiming to the world a shameful act of which he knows or perhaps only suspects his own father to have been guilty; and as an example of its morals, in action rather than in speech, we are referred to the systematic and conscientious murders of the Thugs! We own to a feeling of shame and grief, when we find these wretched and worn-out pleas, with which incompetence and sciolism in philosophy are accustomed to assail the first principles of morals, adopted, in a moment of blindness, by a great religious teacher, and used by him expressly to fling contempt upon the personal reverence for truth and right. Mr. Kingsley must know perfectly well how to answer himself and resolve the perplexities of his own examples. A son who publishes his father's shame acts against natural affection and filial reverence; and no one would justify this, unless the spring of action which he obeys is

higher than that which he puts aside. The "spirit of truth" which he is said to follow may be a very good spirit, and yet may fall in sometimes with a better than itself. It is indeed a mistake to deal with it as a *simple* spring of action at all: for, by its very definition, it compounds and entangles itself with the social affections, postulates them in every act, and takes the complexion of their worth. *Truth* (as here taken) is an affair of *speech*: speech implies the presence of hearers, and has its motive in our relation to them, and our sense of their interest in what we have to say. If the matter which lies ready for utterance belong to the realm of *doctrinal or speculative* belief, it is of cosmopolitan concern; and all men on or near our own intellectual level have a right to expect from our common human feeling a veracious interchange of thought. If it be *political*, the duty springs from national sentiment, and the claim upon us is narrowed to members of the same State. If it be *domestic*, the obligation contracts itself to the circle round the hearth: if *private*, it vanishes from without and falls back into our own solitary mind. A father's guilt,—supposing it to be personal sin, not public crime,—is not a thing that the world at large has any need or any right to know: the son who proclaims it cannot be supposed to act from any solicitation of social affection; and even if he could, still the ascendancy in him, without any constraining obligation from mutual understanding, of the dilute cosmopolitan feeling over the concentrate filial reverence, would be a shocking depravity. It is not his speaking *the truth*, but his speaking *at all*, that we condemn in such a case: and whenever we applaud the "spirit of truth," we refer invariably, not to any fondness for delivering ourselves on all occasions and to every body of the whole volume of our beliefs, but to the disposition never, *at the crises proper for the introduction of a given topic*, to leave a false impression either by what we say or by what we withhold. The choice of proper crises must be determined by various conditions,—many of them foreign to the present question, and contingent on the grouping of social relations in the midst of which we stand. As to the case of Thuggism and other odious fanaticisms, if Mr. Kingsley does not know how to distinguish between

speech against the common opinions of men and overt crimes against their natural rights and common conscience,—if he thinks, as he says, that both alike require “to be restrained,”—he certainly vindicates the claim of his dialogue to its title of “Loose Thoughts for Loose Thinkers;” and in one sense converts us to his own doctrine, that it were well for a man to “restrain” in himself a “spirit of truth” which rushes into ethical questions without accurate insight into their nature or reasonable preparation for their solution. On such subjects it is a very grave responsibility for a public teacher consciously to throw out “*Loose Thoughts*,” and still more to fling them superciliously down as good enough for “*Loose Thinkers*,”—the very persons to whom such homœopathic treatment is sure to be most poisonous. A less careless temerity of argument would better have bespoken a reverence for truth, as holy; and a less flippant title-page have better suited a temper considerate to error, as human.

What then is the amount of our author’s assertion, that the “spirit of truth” is not a *moral* feeling, because it is *indifferent to right and wrong*, as when a son proclaims a father’s shame? Simply this; that the truth of a thing is not of itself sufficient to recommend its utterance at any chance moment when it comes into the mind; but that the right or wrong of speaking it depends on the concurrent presence or absence of other conditions. If this be sufficient to withdraw a feeling from the category “*Moral*,” we have no one moral feeling at all: for there is not a spring of action which has autocratic rights of self-assertion, without taking counsel of whatever other impulses, and whatever outward circumstances, simultaneously appear upon the field. Again: what means the statement, that “the spirit of truth” is not *intellectual*, because, being content with the avowal of sincere though questionable opinion, it is *indifferent to truth and falsehood*? Simply this; that veracity is no sufficient guarantee of knowledge, but may co-exist with mistake. In this sense, it will be allowed on all hands that sincerity of profession is not an *intellectual* quality: but is it therefore to be described as “*indifferent to truth and falsehood*,” a phrase which implies that the sincere man does not care whether his belief be true or false, and that his sincerity bears not

only an indecisive relation, but absolutely *no* relation, to the apprehension of facts as they are? Veracity of profession at all events proceeds on the hypothesis that *reality is best*; and it is so far *intellectual*: and also on the further hypothesis, that to *perceive a reality* is to hold a trust and *lie under an obligation*; and it is so far *moral*. In direct contradiction, therefore, of Mr. Kingsley's assertion, we submit that "the spirit of truth" is *both* intellectual and moral, and *that* without the mixture of any other element whatever. It is indeed inadequate to the determination of truth and duty; but it is concerned with nothing else.

Throughout the argument of our author, the want must be felt, by even his most convinced disciples, of some practical rule, separating the cases in which they ought to declare their belief from those in which they ought to hide it. At last the rule comes out: they are to speak out *when they agree with the many*; to be silent when they have other thoughts of their own. The Atheist, we are told, is bound to conceal his unbelief:—

"For there would be far more chance that he alone was wrong, and the many right, than that the many were wrong, and he alone right. He would therefore commit an insolent and conceited action, and, moreover, a cruel and shameless one; for he would certainly make miserable, if he were believed, the hearts of many virtuous persons who had never harmed him, for no immediate or demonstrable purpose except that of pleasing his own self-will; and that much more, were he wrong in his assertion."—P. 41.

If this process, of consulting the suffrages of mankind, is good against the *expression*, it is good also and antecedently against the *belief* of atheism. The man is to hold his tongue, in the persuasion that most probably he is in the wrong; in the persuasion, therefore, that the evidence goes against him, and that "the Gods exist" after all. So the reasoning stands thus: he ought not to *say*, 'I am an atheist:' why?—because he ought not to *be* an atheist. The obligation to *suppress* the belief is deduced from the obligation to *renounce* it: and the duty of silence about a conviction is made contingent, by our author himself, on the conviction being no longer there to avow. He cannot justify the silence except by expelling the very matter for speech. Thus it turns out impossible, after all, for a high-

minded man, like Mr. Kingsley, to set up a defence of insincerity without translating it back into sincerity first.

The injunction, however, to accept the votes of a majority as decisive of greater probability in questions of religion is futile and impracticable. The authority of numbers and acknowledged wisdom necessarily and properly determines our belief in matters whose inner relations we have never entered; and we receive without question the diagnosis of our physician, and abide by the judgment of our lawyer. But when once we have investigated *the grounds* on which a doctrine rests, and pronounced them to ourselves inadequate, the consciousness of this inadequacy cannot be affected by any reckoning of the votes against us. An outside observer indeed, looking only at our paucity compared with the common voice of all mankind besides, may fairly surmise that when the lots are drawn from the urn of reality, the white ball of truth will not be found with us. But once admitted into the interior processes and texture of belief, we cannot transpose ourselves again into the blind external position, to which alone this computation of chances is approximate: we feel as though we had looked into the urn, and read off the fated rule by which the award must fall. Nor is it just to charge with insolence and conceit those who refuse to surrender the convictions of seeming insight to the voices of other men. It is not modesty, it is not faith, but on the contrary a lax and impious scepticism, to look Reason in the face and say "probably it is a lie," to feel ourselves behind the sacred screen of reality yet treat it as the hiding place of juggleries that play us false. It is a more fatal thing to lose the reverence for *fact*,²—that last root of religion which even atheism does not destroy,—than to lower our intellectual deference for the opinions of mankind. Does Mr. Kingsley really think that, whether there were a God or not, His existence and providence should at all events be taught? Would our author himself, if unhappily he lost his belief in immortality, deem it, notwithstanding, best to keep up the notion and, in giving the moral picture of the world and life, to substitute a fictitious theory of men for the real program of God? Impossible! and yet, if the lips of doubt and disbelief are to be sealed, if philosophy is always to ex-

* W. C. C. Kingsley - 1844 - 1845 - 1846 - 1847 - 1848 - 1849 - 1850 - 1851 - 1852 - 1853 - 1854 - 1855 - 1856 - 1857 - 1858 - 1859 - 1860 - 1861 - 1862 - 1863 - 1864 - 1865 - 1866 - 1867 - 1868 - 1869 - 1870 - 1871 - 1872 - 1873 - 1874 - 1875 - 1876 - 1877 - 1878 - 1879 - 1880 - 1881 - 1882 - 1883 - 1884 - 1885 - 1886 - 1887 - 1888 - 1889 - 1890 - 1891 - 1892 - 1893 - 1894 - 1895 - 1896 - 1897 - 1898 - 1899 - 1900 - 1901 - 1902 - 1903 - 1904 - 1905 - 1906 - 1907 - 1908 - 1909 - 1910 - 1911 - 1912 - 1913 - 1914 - 1915 - 1916 - 1917 - 1918 - 1919 - 1920 - 1921 - 1922 - 1923 - 1924 - 1925 - 1926 - 1927 - 1928 - 1929 - 1930 - 1931 - 1932 - 1933 - 1934 - 1935 - 1936 - 1937 - 1938 - 1939 - 1940 - 1941 - 1942 - 1943 - 1944 - 1945 - 1946 - 1947 - 1948 - 1949 - 1950 - 1951 - 1952 - 1953 - 1954 - 1955 - 1956 - 1957 - 1958 - 1959 - 1960 - 1961 - 1962 - 1963 - 1964 - 1965 - 1966 - 1967 - 1968 - 1969 - 1970 - 1971 - 1972 - 1973 - 1974 - 1975 - 1976 - 1977 - 1978 - 1979 - 1980 - 1981 - 1982 - 1983 - 1984 - 1985 - 1986 - 1987 - 1988 - 1989 - 1990 - 1991 - 1992 - 1993 - 1994 - 1995 - 1996 - 1997 - 1998 - 1999 - 2000 - 2001 - 2002 - 2003 - 2004 - 2005 - 2006 - 2007 - 2008 - 2009 - 2010 - 2011 - 2012 - 2013 - 2014 - 2015 - 2016 - 2017 - 2018 - 2019 - 2020 - 2021 - 2022 - 2023 - 2024 - 2025 - 2026 - 2027 - 2028 - 2029 - 2030 - 2031 - 2032 - 2033 - 2034 - 2035 - 2036 - 2037 - 2038 - 2039 - 2040 - 2041 - 2042 - 2043 - 2044 - 2045 - 2046 - 2047 - 2048 - 2049 - 2050 - 2051 - 2052 - 2053 - 2054 - 2055 - 2056 - 2057 - 2058 - 2059 - 2060 - 2061 - 2062 - 2063 - 2064 - 2065 - 2066 - 2067 - 2068 - 2069 - 2070 - 2071 - 2072 - 2073 - 2074 - 2075 - 2076 - 2077 - 2078 - 2079 - 2080 - 2081 - 2082 - 2083 - 2084 - 2085 - 2086 - 2087 - 2088 - 2089 - 2090 - 2091 - 2092 - 2093 - 2094 - 2095 - 2096 - 2097 - 2098 - 2099 - 2100 - 2101 - 2102 - 2103 - 2104 - 2105 - 2106 - 2107 - 2108 - 2109 - 2110 - 2111 - 2112 - 2113 - 2114 - 2115 - 2116 - 2117 - 2118 - 2119 - 2120 - 2121 - 2122 - 2123 - 2124 - 2125 - 2126 - 2127 - 2128 - 2129 - 2130 - 2131 - 2132 - 2133 - 2134 - 2135 - 2136 - 2137 - 2138 - 2139 - 2140 - 2141 - 2142 - 2143 - 2144 - 2145 - 2146 - 2147 - 2148 - 2149 - 2150 - 2151 - 2152 - 2153 - 2154 - 2155 - 2156 - 2157 - 2158 - 2159 - 2160 - 2161 - 2162 - 2163 - 2164 - 2165 - 2166 - 2167 - 2168 - 2169 - 2170 - 2171 - 2172 - 2173 - 2174 - 2175 - 2176 - 2177 - 2178 - 2179 - 2180 - 2181 - 2182 - 2183 - 2184 - 2185 - 2186 - 2187 - 2188 - 2189 - 2190 - 2191 - 2192 - 2193 - 2194 - 2195 - 2196 - 2197 - 2198 - 2199 - 2200 - 2201 - 2202 - 2203 - 2204 - 2205 - 2206 - 2207 - 2208 - 2209 - 2210 - 2211 - 2212 - 2213 - 2214 - 2215 - 2216 - 2217 - 2218 - 2219 - 2220 - 2221 - 2222 - 2223 - 2224 - 2225 - 2226 - 2227 - 2228 - 2229 - 2230 - 2231 - 2232 - 2233 - 2234 - 2235 - 2236 - 2237 - 2238 - 2239 - 2240 - 2241 - 2242 - 2243 - 2244 - 2245 - 2246 - 2247 - 2248 - 2249 - 2250 - 2251 - 2252 - 2253 - 2254 - 2255 - 2256 - 2257 - 2258 - 2259 - 2260 - 2261 - 2262 - 2263 - 2264 - 2265 - 2266 - 2267 - 2268 - 2269 - 2270 - 2271 - 2272 - 2273 - 2274 - 2275 - 2276 - 2277 - 2278 - 2279 - 2280 - 2281 - 2282 - 2283 - 2284 - 2285 - 2286 - 2287 - 2288 - 2289 - 2290 - 2291 - 2292 - 2293 - 2294 - 2295 - 2296 - 2297 - 2298 - 2299 - 2300 - 2301 - 2302 - 2303 - 2304 - 2305 - 2306 - 2307 - 2308 - 2309 - 2310 - 2311 - 2312 - 2313 - 2314 - 2315 - 2316 - 2317 - 2318 - 2319 - 2320 - 2321 - 2322 - 2323 - 2324 - 2325 - 2326 - 2327 - 2328 - 2329 - 2330 - 2331 - 2332 - 2333 - 2334 - 2335 - 2336 - 2337 - 2338 - 2339 - 2340 - 2341 - 2342 - 2343 - 2344 - 2345 - 2346 - 2347 - 2348 - 2349 - 2350 - 2351 - 2352 - 2353 - 2354 - 2355 - 2356 - 2357 - 2358 - 2359 - 2360 - 2361 - 2362 - 2363 - 2364 - 2365 - 2366 - 2367 - 2368 - 2369 - 2370 - 2371 - 2372 - 2373 - 2374 - 2375 - 2376 - 2377 - 2378 - 2379 - 2380 - 2381 - 2382 - 2383 - 2384 - 2385 - 2386 - 2387 - 2388 - 2389 - 2390 - 2391 - 2392 - 2393 - 2394 - 2395 - 2396 - 2397 - 2398 - 2399 - 2400 - 2401 - 2402 - 2403 - 2404 - 2405 - 2406 - 2407 - 2408 - 2409 - 2410 - 2411 - 2412 - 2413 - 2414 - 2415 - 2416 - 2417 - 2418 - 2419 - 2420 - 2421 - 2422 - 2423 - 2424 - 2425 - 2426 - 2427 - 2428 - 2429 - 2430 - 2431 - 2432 - 2433 - 2434 - 2435 - 2436 - 2437 - 2438 - 2439 - 2440 - 2441 - 2442 - 2443 - 2444 - 2445 - 2446 - 2447 - 2448 - 2449 - 2450 - 2451 - 2452 - 2453 - 2454 - 2455 - 2456 - 2457 - 2458 - 2459 - 2460 - 2461 - 2462 - 2463 - 2464 - 2465 - 2466 - 2467 - 2468 - 2469 - 2470 - 2471 - 2472 - 2473 - 2474 - 2475 - 2476 - 2477 - 2478 - 2479 - 2480 - 2481 - 2482 - 2483 - 2484 - 2485 - 2486 - 2487 - 2488 - 2489 - 2490 - 2491 - 2492 - 2493 - 2494 - 2495 - 2496 - 2497 - 2498 - 2499 - 2500 - 2501 - 2502 - 2503 - 2504 - 2505 - 2506 - 2507 - 2508 - 2509 - 2510 - 2511 - 2512 - 2513 - 2514 - 2515 - 2516 - 2517 - 2518 - 2519 - 2520 - 2521 - 2522 - 2523 - 2524 - 2525 - 2526 - 2527 - 2528 - 2529 - 2530 - 2531 - 2532 - 2533 - 2534 - 2535 - 2536 - 2537 - 2538 - 2539 - 2540 - 2541 - 2542 - 2543 - 2544 - 2545 - 2546 - 2547 - 2548 - 2549 - 2550 - 2551 - 2552 - 2553 - 2554 - 2555 - 2556 - 2557 - 2558 - 2559 - 2560 - 2561 - 2562 - 2563 - 2564 - 2565 - 2566 - 2567 - 2568 - 2569 - 2570 - 2571 - 2572 - 2573 - 2574 - 2575 - 2576 - 2577 - 2578 - 2579 - 2580 - 2581 - 2582 - 2583 - 2584 - 2585 - 2586 - 2587 - 2588 - 2589 - 2590 - 2591 - 2592 - 2593 - 2594 - 2595 - 2596 - 2597 - 2598 - 2599 - 2600 - 2601 - 2602 - 2603 - 2604 - 2605 - 2606 - 2607 - 2608 - 2609 - 2610 - 2611 - 2612 - 2613 - 2614 - 2615 - 2616 - 2617 - 2618 - 2619 - 2620 - 2621 - 2622 - 2623 - 2624 - 2625 - 2626 - 2627 - 2628 - 2629 - 2630 - 2631 - 2632 - 2633 - 2634 - 2635 - 2636 - 2637 - 2638 - 2639 - 2640 - 2641 - 2642 - 2643 - 2644 - 2645 - 2646 - 2647 - 2648 - 2649 - 2650 - 2651 - 2652 - 2653 - 2654 - 2655 - 2656 - 2657 - 2658 - 2659 - 2660 - 2661 - 2662 - 2663 - 2664 - 2665 - 2666 - 2667 - 2668 - 2669 - 2670 - 2671 - 2672 - 2673 - 2674 - 2675 - 2676 - 2677 - 2678 - 2679 - 2680 - 2681 - 2682 - 2683 - 2684 - 2685 - 2686 - 2687 - 2688 - 2689 - 2690 - 2691 - 2692 - 2693 - 2694 - 2695 - 2696 - 2697 - 2698 - 2699 - 2700 - 2701 - 2702 - 2703 - 2704 - 2705 - 2706 - 2707 - 2708 - 2709 - 2710 - 2711 - 2712 - 2713 - 2714 - 2715 - 2716 - 2717 - 2718 - 2719 - 2720 - 2721 - 2722 - 2723 - 2724 - 2725 - 2726 - 2727 - 2728 - 2729 - 2730 - 2731 - 2732 - 2733 - 2734 - 2735 - 2736 - 2737 - 2738 - 2739 - 2740 - 2741 - 2742 - 2743 - 2744 - 2745 - 2746 - 2747 - 2748 - 2749 - 2750 - 2751 - 2752 - 2753 - 2754 - 2755 - 2756 - 2757 - 2758 - 2759 - 2760 - 2761 - 2762 - 2763 - 2764 - 2765 - 2766 - 2767 - 2768 - 2769 - 2770 - 2771 - 2772 - 2773 - 2774 - 2775 - 2776 - 2777 - 2778 - 2779 - 2780 - 2781 - 2782 - 2783 - 2784 - 2785 - 2786 - 2787 - 2788 - 2789 - 2790 - 2791 - 2792 - 2793 - 2794 - 2795 - 2796 - 2797 - 2798 - 2799 - 2800 - 2801 - 2802 - 2803 - 2804 - 2805 - 2806 - 2807 - 2808 - 2809 - 2810 - 2811 - 2812 - 2813 - 2814 - 2815 - 2816 - 2817 - 2818 - 2819 - 2820 - 2821 - 2822 - 2823 - 2824 - 2825 - 2826 - 2827 - 2828 - 2829 - 2830 - 2831 - 2832 - 2833 - 2834 - 2835 - 2836 - 2837 - 2838 - 2839 - 2840 - 2841 - 2842 - 2843 - 2844 - 2845 - 2846 - 2847 - 2848 - 2849 - 2850 - 2851 - 2852 - 2853 - 2854 - 2855 - 2856 - 2857 - 2858 - 2859 - 2860 - 2861 - 2862 - 2863 - 2864 - 2865 - 2866 - 2867 - 2868 - 2869 - 2870 - 2871 - 2872 - 2873 - 2874 - 2875 - 2876 - 2877 - 2878 - 2879 - 2880 - 2881 - 2882 - 2883 - 2884 - 2885 - 2886 - 2887 - 2888 - 2889 - 2890 - 2891 - 2892 - 2893 - 2894 - 2895 - 2896 - 2897 - 2898 - 2899 - 2900 - 2901 - 2902 - 2903 - 2904 - 2905 - 2906 - 2907 - 2908 - 2909 - 2910 - 2911 - 2912 - 2913 - 2914 - 2915 - 2916 - 2917 - 2918 - 2919 - 2920 - 2921 - 2922 - 2923 - 2924 - 2925 - 2926 - 2927 - 2928 - 2929 - 2930 - 2931 - 2932 - 2933 - 2934 - 2935 - 2936 - 2937 - 2938 - 2939 - 2940 - 2941 - 2942 - 2943 - 2944 - 2945 - 2946 - 2947 - 2948 - 2949 - 2950 - 2951 - 2952 - 2953 - 2954 - 2955 - 2956 - 2957 - 2958 - 2959 - 2960 - 2961 - 2962 - 2963 - 2964 - 2965 - 2966 - 2967 - 2968 - 2969 - 2970 - 2971 - 2972 - 2973 - 2974 - 2975 - 2976 - 2977 - 2978 - 2979 - 2980 - 2981 - 2982 - 2983 - 2984 - 2985 - 2986 - 2987 - 2988 - 2989 - 2990 - 2991 - 2992 - 2993 - 2994 - 2995 - 2996 - 2997 - 2998 - 2999 - 3000 - 3001 - 3002 - 3003 - 3004 - 3005 - 3006 - 3007 - 3008 - 3009 - 3010 - 3011 - 3012 - 3013 - 3014 - 3015 - 3016 - 3017 - 3018 - 3019 - 3020 - 3021 - 3022 - 3023 - 3024 - 3025 - 3026 - 3027 - 3028 - 3029 - 3030 - 3031 - 3032 - 3033 - 3034 - 3035 - 3036 - 3037 - 3038 - 3039 - 3040 - 3041 - 3042 - 3043 - 3044 - 3045 - 3046 - 3047 - 3048 - 3049 - 3050 - 3051 - 3052 - 3053 - 3054 - 3055 - 3056 - 3057 - 3058 - 3059 - 3060 - 3061 - 3062 - 3063 - 3064 - 3065 - 3066 - 3067 - 3068 - 3069 - 3070 - 3071 - 3072 - 3073 - 3074 - 3075 - 3076 - 3077 - 3078 - 3079 - 3080 - 3081 - 3082 - 3083 - 3084 - 3085 - 3086 - 3087 - 3088 - 3089 - 3090 - 3091 - 3092 - 3093 - 3094 - 3095 - 3096 - 3097 - 3098 - 3099 - 3100 - 3101 - 3102 - 3103 - 3104 - 3105 - 3106 - 3107 - 3108 - 3109 - 3110 - 3111 - 3112 - 3113 - 3114 - 3115 - 3116 - 3117 - 3118 - 3119 - 3120 - 3121 - 3122 - 3123 - 3124 - 3125 - 3126 - 3127 - 3128 - 3129 - 3130 - 3131 - 3132 - 3133 - 3134 - 3135 - 3136 - 3137 - 3138 - 3139 - 3140 - 3141 - 3142 - 3143 - 3144 - 3145 - 3146 - 3147 - 3148 - 3149 - 3150 - 3151 - 3152 - 3153 - 3154 - 3155 - 3156 - 3157 - 3158 - 3159 - 3160 - 3161 - 3162 - 3163 - 3164 - 3165 - 3166 - 3167 - 3168 - 3169 - 3170 - 3171 - 3172 - 3173 - 3174 - 3175 - 3176 - 3177 - 3178 - 3179 - 3180 - 3181 - 3182 - 3183 - 3184 - 3185 - 3186 - 3187 - 3188 - 3189 - 3190 - 3191 - 3192 - 3193 - 3194 - 3195 - 3196 - 3197 - 3198 - 3199 - 3200 - 3201 - 3202 - 3203 - 3204 - 3205 - 3206 - 3207 - 3208 - 3209 - 3210 - 3211 - 3212 - 3213 - 3214 - 3215 - 3216 - 3217 - 3218 - 3219 - 3220 - 3221 - 3222 - 3223 - 3224 - 3225 - 3226 - 3227 - 3228 - 3229 - 3230 - 3231 - 3232 - 3233 - 3234 - 3235 - 3236 - 3237 - 3238 - 3239 - 3240 - 3241 - 3242 - 3243 - 3244 - 3245 - 3246 - 3247 - 3248 - 3249 - 3250 - 3251 - 3252 - 3253 - 3254 - 3255 - 3256 - 3257 - 3258 - 3259 - 3260 - 3261 - 3262 - 3263 - 3264 - 3265 - 3266 - 3267 - 3268 - 3269 - 3270 - 3271 - 3272 - 3273 - 3274 - 3275 - 3276 - 3277 - 3278 - 3279 - 3280 - 3281 - 3282 - 3283 - 3284 - 3285 - 3286 - 3287 - 3288 - 3289 - 3290 - 3291 - 3292 - 3293 - 3294 - 3295 - 3296 - 3297 - 3298 - 3299 - 3300 - 3301 - 3302 - 3303 - 3304 - 3305 - 3306 - 3307 - 3308 - 3309 - 3310 - 3311 - 3312 - 3313 - 3314 - 3315 - 3316 - 3317 - 3318 - 3319 - 3320 - 3321 - 3322 - 3323 - 3324 - 3325 - 3326 - 3327 - 3328 - 3329 - 3330 - 3331 - 3332 - 3333 - 3334 - 3335 - 3336 - 3337 - 3338 - 3339 - 3340 - 3341 - 3342 - 3343 - 3344 - 3345 - 3346 - 3347 - 3348 - 3349 - 3350 - 3351 - 3352 - 3353 - 3354 - 3355 - 3356 - 3357 - 3358 - 3359 - 3360 - 3361 - 3362 - 3363 - 3364 - 3365 - 3366 - 3367 - 3368 - 3369 - 3370 - 3371 - 3372 - 3373 - 3374 - 3375 - 3376 - 3377 - 3378 - 3379 - 3380 - 3381 - 3382 - 3383 - 3384 - 3385 - 3386 - 3387 - 3388 - 3389 - 3390 - 3391 - 3392 - 3393 - 3394 - 3395 - 3396 - 3397 - 3398 - 3399 - 3400 - 3401 - 3402 - 3403 - 3404 - 3405 - 3406 - 3407 - 3408 - 3409 - 3410 - 3411 - 3412 - 3413 - 3414 - 3415 - 3416 - 3417 - 3418 - 3419 - 3420 - 3421 - 3422 - 3423 - 3424 - 3425 - 3426 - 3427 - 3428 - 3429 - 3430 - 3431 - 3432 - 3433 - 3434 - 3435 - 3436 - 3437 - 3438 - 3439 - 3440 - 3441 - 3442 - 3443 - 3444 - 3445 - 3446 - 3447 - 3448 - 3449 - 3450 - 3451 - 3452 - 3453 - 3454 - 3455 - 3456 - 3457 - 3458 - 3459 - 3460 - 3461 - 3462 - 3463 - 3464 - 3465 - 3466 - 3467 - 3468 - 3469 - 3470 - 3471 - 3472 - 3473 - 3474 - 3475 - 3476 - 3477 - 3478 - 3479 - 3480 - 3481 - 3482 - 3483 - 3484 - 3485 - 3486 - 3487 - 3488 - 3489 - 3490 - 3491 - 3492 - 3493 - 3494 - 3495 - 3496 - 3497 - 3498 - 3499 - 3500 - 3501 - 3502 - 3503 - 3504 - 3505 - 3506 - 3507 - 3508 - 3509 - 3510 - 3511 - 3512 - 3513 - 3514 - 3515 - 3516 - 3517 - 3518 - 3519 - 3520 - 3521 - 3522 - 3523 - 3524 - 3525 - 3526 - 3527 - 3528 - 3529 - 3530 - 3531 - 3532 - 3533 - 3534 - 3535 - 3536 - 3537 - 3538 - 3539 - 3540 - 3541 - 3542 - 3543 - 3544 - 3545 - 3546 - 3547 - 3548 - 3549 - 3550 - 3551 - 3552 - 3553 - 3554 - 3555 - 3556 - 3557 - 3558 - 3559 - 3560 - 3561 - 3562 - 3563 - 3564 - 3565 - 3566 - 3567 - 3568 - 3569 - 3570 - 3571 - 3572 - 3573 - 3574 - 3575 - 3576 - 3577 - 3578 - 3579 - 3580 - 3581 - 3582 - 3583 - 3584 - 3585 - 3586 - 3587 - 3588 - 3589 - 3590 - 3591 - 3592 - 3593 - 3594 - 3595 - 3596 - 3597 - 3598 - 3599 - 3600 - 3601 - 3602 - 3603 - 3604 - 3605 - 3606 - 3607 - 3608 - 3609 - 3610 - 3611 - 3612 - 3613 - 3614 - 3615 - 3616 - 3617 - 3618 - 3619 - 3620 - 3621 - 3622 - 3623 - 3624 - 3625 - 3626 - 3627 - 3628 - 3629 - 3630 - 3631 - 3632 - 3633 - 3634 - 3635 - 3636 - 3637 - 3638 - 3639 - 3640 - 3641 - 3642 - 3643 - 3644 - 3645 - 3646 - 3647 - 3648 - 3649 - 3650 - 3651 - 3652 - 3653 - 3654 - 3655 - 3656 - 3657 - 3658 - 3659 - 3660 - 3661 - 3662 - 3663 - 3664 - 3665 - 3666 - 3667 - 3668 - 3669 - 3670 - 3671 - 3672 - 3673 - 3674 - 3675 - 3676 - 3677 - 3678 - 3679 - 3680 - 3681 - 3682 - 3683 - 3684 - 3685 - 3686 - 3687 - 3688 - 3689 - 3690 - 3691 - 3692 - 3693 - 3694 - 3695 - 3696 - 3697 - 3698 - 3699 - 3700 - 3701 - 3702 - 3703 - 3704 - 3705 - 3706 - 3707 - 3708 - 3709 - 3710 - 3711 - 3712 - 3713 - 3714 - 3715 - 3716 - 3717 - 3718 - 3719 - 3720 - 3721 - 3722 - 3723 - 3724 - 3725 - 3726 - 3727 - 3728 - 3729 - 3730 - 3731 - 3732 - 3733 - 3734 - 3735 - 3736 - 3737 - 3738 - 3739 - 3740 - 3741 - 3742 - 3743 - 3744 - 3745 - 3746 - 3747 - 3748 - 3749 - 3750 - 3751 - 3752 - 3753 - 3754 - 3755 - 3756 - 3757 - 3758 - 3759 - 3760 - 3761 - 3762 - 3763 - 3764 - 3765 - 3766 - 3767 - 3768 - 3769 - 3770 - 3771 - 3772 - 3773 - 3774 - 3775 - 3776 - 3777 - 3778 - 3779 - 3780 - 3781 - 3782 - 3783 - 3784 - 3785 - 3786 - 3787 -

pound and never to dispute the *consensus* of the greater multitude, this doctrine of imposture cannot be escaped.

Sufficient discredit having been thrown upon the Windrush spirit-of-truth, it disappears from the dialogue: and in its place the author's real spirit of truth presents itself for interpretation. To release it from its subjective limits as a mere private propensity, to assign to it not only an objective but a Divine and self-conscious nature, in fine, to raise it to the character of the Logos as a common medium of reason between the minds of men and God, is the purpose of this concluding portion of the discussion. We cannot profess to think either the reasoning or the conclusion satisfactory: the one appears to us illogical, and the other Pantheistic. The arguments are these: (1.) The spirit of truth *tells* facts as they are; therefore *sees* them as they are; but this is a power possessed exclusively by God; therefore the light by which moral truth is discerned is not human, but divine. (2.) What we *long for*, is not yet possessed by us, is moreover beyond us and not either an effect or a part of us: we long for truth; which is therefore beyond our personality,—is not ours to win or to possess: hence the spirit of truth is a foreign agency which *possesses us* and vouchsafes to us a portion of holy light. (3.) As *seeing*, the spirit of truth is *intellectual*; as seeing facts of a moral nature, it is *moral*; therefore, also *personal*; and as seeing God, it is God, who alone can know himself. In calling the conclusion Pantheistic, we do not use this much-abused word vaguely but strictly, to express the sacrifice of the human personality to the claims of the Divine Infinitude. The spirit of truth, being that whereby we see facts as they are, is co-extensive in us with our rational nature: and if, in being personal, it be God himself, what personality is left for us? Our whole rational nature being flung away into the Infinite Mind, nothing remains but the brute element in us, where it were vain to look for any attribute that will keep us in the rank of *persons*, and prevent us from being only *things*. God thus becomes the only Intellect of the universe: and though our personality is surrendered for no other purpose than to provide for His, and the doctrine of a Personal God may thus appear to be pre-eminently secure; yet those

who have studied the courses of human belief know that the very reverse is true; that without the relation between two persons, there cannot long survive the attributes of one; and that to drown the human soul is, for purposes of faith, to desolate if not to dissipate the Divine. This very inference, moreover, by which our author reduces the persons in the universe to One, is drawn from an argument which supposes *two*:—there is a being who *longs* for the truth, and is therefore *a person*: there is *an object longed for*; which again is affirmed to be *also a person*: there are consequently in the premises two persons who, in the conclusion, disappear into one. We content ourselves with pointing out this interior contradiction in Mr. Kingsley's doctrine: without pressing any further analysis upon arguments which probably have neither convinced any reader, nor served as the real grounds of conviction to the author himself.

But there is one inference deduced from his theory, which must not be passed without remark. If all our intellectual apprehension is a direct presence of God in person, it must be and must give only pure and unmixed truth. Whence then the errors into which we fall? Since the divine light is without blemish, and is never denied to our longing prayer, its deficiency and failure must be ascribed to the want on our part of adequate love and aspiration. In other words, mistaken judgments and discordant faiths, are referable solely to moral causes and are to be regarded as proofs of guilt.

“*Phaethon*. ‘Yet what are we to say of those who, sincerely loving and longing after knowledge, yet arrive at false conclusions, which are proved to be false by contradicting each other?’

“*Socrates*. ‘We are to say, *Phaethon*, that they have not loved knowledge enough to desire utterly to see facts as they are, but only to see them as they would wish them to be; and loving themselves rather than Zeus, have wished to remodel in some things or other his universe, according to their own subjective opinions. By this, or by some other act of self-will, or self-conceit, or self-dependence, they have compelled Zeus, not, as I think, without pity and kindness to them, to withdraw from them in some degree the sight of his own beauty. We must therefore, I fear, liken them to Acharis, the painter of Lemnos, who, intending to represent Phæbus, painted from a mirror a copy of his own defects and deformities;

or perhaps to that Nymph, who finding herself beloved by Phœbus, instead of reverently and silently returning his affection, boasted of it to all her neighbours as a token of her own beauty and despised the God; so that he, being angry, changed her into a chattering magpie; or again to Arachne, who having been taught the art of weaving by Athene, pretended to compete with her own instructress, and being metamorphosed by her into a spider, was condemned, like the sophists, to spin out of her own entrails endless ugly webs, which are destroyed, as soon as finished, by every slave-girl's broom.'"—Page 64.

This is a characteristic instance of Mr. Kingsley's tendency to dash, out of the repulsions of a partial experience, into the most extravagant antagonism of judgment. It is conspicuous and undeniable that moral causes have not merely a collateral and accidental, but a direct and essential, influence in the formation of human beliefs; and especially that the religious faith of men is so immediate a product of their affections and conscience, that the logical thought stands to it chiefly in a negative relation, determining its limits and systematising its form. That self-worship renders all religion impossible, that exclusive confidence in the will breaks it short off at morality, that the over-balance of conscience makes it superstitious, and that of love, fanatical; are certainties of deepest import, with which the doctrine of the involuntary and irresponsible nature of belief requires to be qualified. For any liberalism which denies these things; which releases us from a holy vigilance as to the secret springs of our faith or doubt; which forbids us ever to see in bigotry or in disbelief a root of conceit and arrogance however obvious the symptoms may be to every eye, we feel nothing but contempt. But our *moral* criticism is not, in such instances, visited upon the opinions, as such: it addresses itself to the concomitant temper and natural language of character; and whenever these present the aspect of purity and reverence, it joyfully believes in this good sign, and retires within the pale of equal intellectual discussion. In this view, error is treated as having origin, possibly indeed from moral sources; but possibly also from unmoral; and as never to be referred to the former, in the absence of justifying indications. Mr. Kingsley's doctrine, on the other hand, stops up every opening for charitable construction, and

requires us to look on all intellectual differences as the product and the symptoms of a bad heart. On the strength of mere error and mutual contradiction we are to presume the existence in men of evil passions which make no sign; to disbelieve the fair look of candour and piety, and exchange our natural trust and admiration for dogmatic pity and suspicion. The moral scepticism implied in this tenet,—the willingness to accept creed-evidence against character,—is the most melancholy delusion which ecclesiastic unity has introduced into philosophy and life: and we are sorry that Mr. Kingsley, whether in recoil from American free-thinkers, or from entanglement with the "Catholic creeds," has allowed his generous nature to be betrayed into so ungenial a sophistry.

After all, we have somehow the feeling, on laying down this little book, that Mr. Kingsley does not really *mean* its narrowness and fallacies, and is truly himself in all its beauty, truth and nobleness. The dialectic is *made up*; the deep sentiment is his own. Laughter at his eccentric logic passes into tears at the pathetic faithfulness with which he draws the agonies of doubt beneath the fair surface of English opulence and culture. That society throughout Europe is rapidly suffering a loss of moral strength from the decay of clear and assured faith is but too certain: and no one has a juster discernment of this fact than Mr. Kingsley. He appreciates it in its breadth: he sees it in its detail: he reads its hidden drama beneath the vicissitudes of states, and the decadence of churches. If he will but cease to tamper with philosophy and neither rail at it nor adopt it,—if he will only paint and preach,—if he will simply tell the visions which the living spectacle of the world flings upon his mind, and announce without proving the faiths deepest in his being; he is fitted to be among the prophets of recovery, who may prepare for us a more wholesome future otherwise than by vain reproduction of the past.

ART. V.—THE FRENCH PURITANS.

1. *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: a History of France principally during that Period.* By Leopold Ranke. Translated by M. A. Garvey. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Bentley. 1852.
2. *Lectures on the History of France.* By the Right Hon. Sir James Stephen, K.C.B., LL.D., Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Longman and Co. Second Edition. 1852.

AMONG the most innocent, if not the most valuable, occupations of Englishmen in the middle of the last century, was the attempt to discover what was familiarly known as PERPETUAL MOTION. In this laudable pursuit, scarcely less enthusiasm and mental labour were expended, than in the far-famed search in earlier times after the Philosopher's Stone. The century however died out, and the men of science whose minds had been formed during its earlier portion one by one disappeared, and still the idea which lay so near their hearts seemed as far as ever from being realised. But had they survived into the first half of the succeeding century, we think they would have recognised in that century itself the complete embodiment of their cherished theory. If the testimony of every one's every-day experience is to be allowed any weight, the nineteenth century may fairly repudiate REST as one of its constituent elements. We do not now refer to the external movements, which convulse civil society, and render kings, constitutions, and territorial distributions as ephemeral as the morning paper which records their destiny. We refer rather to the revolutions within the domain of Dame Knowledge;—those changes which have driven into hopeless exile all our old text books of learning, and which have left scarcely one inch of safe and solid ground on which the scholar may rest the sole of his foot. Tell us, indeed, that the road of education has been smoothed before the rising generation! Look to the facts of the

case, and a very different answer will be returned. Where is that pleasant life that once the scholar led, when there were a certain number of orthodox questions, to which there were a certain number of orthodox answers; with which, when once made familiar, the youth's education was declared to be finished, and he embarked on the sea of life with the pride and consolation of being as wise as his forefathers? Those were the days when Papas and Mammias did not live in dread of holiday ebullitions of new-age wisdom on the part of their inquiring offspring; when elderly ladies were not put to shame by their nieces and granddaughters, on the cardinal points of school-education, and when grey-headed old gentlemen were not repulsed into indignant silence by intimations from young hopefuls of sceptical tendencies, that "all *that* has been long ago exploded!" In no province of knowledge has this revolutionary spirit displayed itself with more remarkable results than in the study of History. During the last century, Hume, Gibbon, Goldsmith, and Gillies sat aloft in unquestioned dictatorship. Grumblers and sceptics there might be in bye-corners, and here and there a mind formed in another school might ruffle a little the uniform current of popular opinion. But these partial heresies never affected permanently the notions of the age; certainly never penetrated the interiors of ordinary schools; never shook for any length of time the public impression of the accuracy of their great historians, and of the school-histories modelled upon them. With few exceptions society had settled its mind about the history of the past; knew who were the good men and who the bad; could sharply divide the world's vicissitudes into chapters of "prosperous" and "calamitous" events; knew exactly where great men of yore went wrong, and could trace accurately their deviations from the principles of the British Constitution; had pat and ready the dates of the foundations of all the empires; knew the first kings and the chief cities; felt that the history of its own country had been long ago written out, and was *there*; and respecting the history of other countries, felt the need of just so much knowledge as would enable it to distinguish Charles V. of Germany from Francis of France, to say who were the kings taken prisoners at Poitiers and Nevil's Cross; who sent his invin-

cible Armada to be conquered, and who fought with Marlborough and Eugene at Blenheim. All this society knew, and knew what was to be said about it, and with this society rested satisfied. But times have changed; the old ship is unseaworthy, and happy he who can safely float to land on a raft of his own construction. Facts have become nearly as uncertain as opinions, the old gods are thrown down from their pedestals, and every sucking student of seventeen sits in the Censor's chair, and passes judgment on the works of a Gibbon and a Hume. Every publishing season presents us with new books to disprove old stock-facts, and then with newer books to disprove both the old facts and the new theories of the new books. Public libraries are ransacked; State-papers are edited with learned notes; family biographers rush to the rescue of the memory of their ancestors with "unpublished letters," and "exclusive sources of information." Every one of these latter brings in its train endless similar productions; for such is the perversity of history, that the vindication of one man is generally of necessity the condemnation of three or four others, all of whom have friends or descendants who can write, and do so forthwith. Chroniclers and monkish historians of the middle ages no longer come to us through the medium of a modern author, and translated into a dress consistent with modern notions; but are presented to us first-hand in all the quaint habiliments of the past. The stranger their garb, the more uncouth their language, the greater its dissonance with the old voices of authority, the more cordial their reception, the greater the confidence in their value. Against this inroad of new facts and contradictory assertions, how is it to be expected that our old text-books should stand their ground? They have succumbed in all directions, and have been succeeded by a variety of schools of history, and an endless diversity as to facts and inferences within each of these schools. To say that all this new light, and all these new materials for the formation of juster opinions as to the past, are to be looked upon as other than a great good, would be palpably absurd. Our task as students of history may be a heavier or more complicated one; we may have much more frequently to confess our ignorance, or that such and such a point must remain for the present doubtful: but we feel convinced

that the uncertainty which has been thrown on so many events will only be of temporary duration, and arises from the habit of attributing too much value to specific sources of information, rather than from the rapid accumulation of materials. It is too much the custom of historical students in the nineteenth century, to look on each new contribution to history as an authority which may at once supersede previous ones wherever it differs from them. There is no discrimination in the value assigned to the new materials; all are treated as if they stood upon equal ground, and there seems to be an almost morbid desire to receive their authority where they contradict previously-established conclusions. There is not enough suspension of judgment until the publication of several of these *ex parte* statements has given us the means of comparison, and a broader basis for our deductions. We are continually being told that such and such a thing has been disproved, and such another thing has been established, and when we inquire into the authority on which the correction rests, we frequently find that beyond the fact that a novel assertion has been made, there is little reason for supposing that we have arrived at positive truth. Concurrently with this hasty judgment on fresh materials, and in no slight degree connected with it as its originating cause, we have in the recent treatment of history, pretensions advanced in behalf of that study, which go far to destroy its actual value. A new word has been coined which expresses something to which history is rapidly becoming a handmaid—a very miserable one, too—a servant of all-work. This is SOCIOLOGY. History is now looked upon by many minds as valuable, not as a record of the past, and a curious diary of human nature, but as the Bible of a system of political and moral philosophy for the guidance of the present, and for the assurance of the future. Here the Republican, the Ultra-Royalist, the Anti-State-Churchman, the Anglo-Catholic, and the Roman-Catholic, find the proofs of the efficacy of their doctrine in times past—the axioms for its propagation in times to come. With the zeal of heated partizans they ransack the archives of History, invoke new allies from the obscurity of dusty shelves and unexplored chests; defend what has been held to be established fact where it accords with their own views; overwhelm it with

their new discoveries where it ventures to contradict them. Events and the actors in them are alike subjected to an unrelenting inquisition. Under the pressure of these literary tortures, they make strange confessions. Innocent facts confess to extraordinary significance; unpremeditated actions avow a long train of impulses; the men of one age own to the prejudices and convictions of centuries later. Thus even when we have the same facts, the method of arrangement in different authors, and the ingenious and half-unconscious colouring of party prejudice, render them so unlike that we can scarcely believe our eyes when we see the same authorities appearing in defence of both authors' positions at the bottom of their respective pages. We believe there are symptoms of a reaction against this excess of philosophising on history. When the public are told from every side that history proves this and that to be the proper course for the politician, the statesman, and the moralist, and find in the midst of the most dogmatic assertions the greatest possible contrariety of opinion, they naturally begin to distrust these lofty pretensions, and the consequence we fear will be, that the real philosophy which we may gather from history will be cast aside as worthless along with the dross, and that we may once more degenerate into mere chronicle-writing, and see in the historic drama no more than a tedious tale written in a dead language. But History, however exaggerated may be the claims which have been advanced in her name, is still an undoubted schoolmistress of the times. She cannot, indeed, profess to teach the statesman how in so different an age from any of those which her pages pourtray, he can rule with a success emulative of the earlier fame of great men, but she can present to him scenes of apparently hopeless despair, which the strong heart and the unwavering hand have converted into the forerunners of complete recovery and joyous triumph. When the power of evil seems greatest around him, and the assurances of hope seem faint and far, she cannot, it is true, point out to him in the past a complete facsimile of the present, nor can she teach him from her crowded pages the true science of politics, but she can carry him over large spaces of time, and show him how, while patriots grow false or cold, and injustice springs again from the earth to which it had been struck, a nation,

by the virtue and perseverance of but few or one mind, may recover itself from its prostrate condition, and under the auspices of a guiding Providence once more assume its former high position. Thus fortified by examples of ill leading ultimately to the secure possession of good, he will no longer see in every failure the precursor of ruin, and the signal for despair, but will hail the coming success from amidst the shadows of defeat. Lessons such as these—experience, namely, of the varying phases which ultimately successful causes have assumed during their struggles—and similar examples of the natural workings of human nature, may, without any strained interpretation of men or their motives, be deduced from the patent facts of History; and there are times when their necessity is felt more than at others, and when their application to some one nation is felt to be of more marked consequence than it otherwise would be. We believe France to be in a position in which the lessons of the past may be deduced with much advantage, if not to the actors in her present history, at least to the spectators, who stand around to applaud or reprobate. We therefore hail with gladness the appearance in this country of two works, which, from the high literary position of their authors, are likely to attract considerable attention to the subject of their labours. M. Ranke's work deals with facts, several of which he presents to us in a novel form, shaped according to the authority of the secret despatches of foreign ambassadors. The former part of our remarks, therefore, apply more especially to him, and while welcoming his contribution to French History, we must not too hastily suppose that the authority of the Venetian Ambassador is to override all previous authorities, and to henceforward determine our estimate of Catherine de Medicis, the Guises, or Henry of Navarre. Sir James Stephen's Lectures are rather expositions of certain points of Sociology, and especially of the working of Providence in human affairs. In reading them, therefore, we are more likely to fall into the other error to which we have observed that History is exposed, that of making her too much a mere handmaid to particular theories, and seeing in every event a meaning with reference to those theories, which it is wholly inadequate to sustain. Taken in conjunction, however, and as supple-

ments to the standard History of France, these new publications will be found to possess as much value, as, taken separately, they are likely in somewhat different quarters to excite a large amount of interest. One period which is common to both possesses in our opinion especial importance at the present moment, and we, therefore, avail ourselves of the appearance of these volumes to bring it in a connected form before the notice of our readers. We mean that period which records the rise and struggles for existence and ascendancy of what we may not inaptly call FRENCH PURITANISM.

We are fond, as Englishmen, of comparing the fate of our own country with that of her neighbour. We are, not unjustly, proud of our constitution, and look with compassionate contempt on the evanescent charters of French liberty, and the alternate succession of license and tyranny in that rival state. We like to philosophise on the causes of this difference in destiny of two powerful nations. We lay much stress on our national character as a chief element in our superior success. We compare together the Frenchman and the Englishman of the nineteenth century, and see in their respective characteristics an evident explanation of the fate which attends each. We point with pride to the struggles and sufferings of the patriot band which two centuries ago withstood and overthrew the growing tyranny of our Stuart Kings; and we point with pride to their forerunners in the regeneration of our land, the martyrs in the reign of Mary, and the men who supported, directed, and controlled the strong arm of Elizabeth. But we are accustomed to look upon these great manifestations of religious and patriotic zeal as confined to, and the home growth of, the English soil. The ill-fortune of liberty on the other side of the channel has made us turn away from the tale of her struggles there, as if it could disclose no aspirations for better things with which the countrymen of Pym or Hampden could sympathise; no upheavings of popular feeling which could remind us of our own great struggles for civil and religious liberty. But impartial History tells us another story, and teaches us that there were movements and men to guide them in France, that may rank side by side with some of our own proudest recollections. It is a curious problem then to assign the

reasons why in one country all these noble efforts proved fruitless, while in the other they were the sources of an enduring national prosperity. "To have emancipated the human mind from the errors of Papal Rome," observes Sir James Stephen, "is but one of the many triumphs of the Reformation. In almost every part of the Christian world, that great religious enfranchisement was followed by civil liberty, as at once its offspring and its guardian." He might have added that the guardianship is reciprocal, and that civil liberty owes its preservation almost as completely as its origin to religious freedom. "But in France," he continues, "it was otherwise; and I proceed to inquire, how it happened that the protest made by so large a part of the French people against the tyranny of the Roman Church, was not followed by any effectual resistance to the despotism of the reigning dynasty." Both Sir James Stephen expressly, and M. Ranke incidentally, attempt to assign reasons which they think adequate to explain this apparent anomaly. Many of these appear to us just in themselves, and not to be overlooked in any full consideration of the subject. We doubt, however, whether, at least in the disconnected form in which these writers bring them before us, they will leave on the mind of the reader the impression of a satisfactory solution of the problem. At any rate it has occurred to ourselves, that they might be arranged and systematised, so as to afford something more closely approaching a train of consecutive reasoning.

In obtaining clear ideas of the phenomena of French society and of the French constitution in Church and State in the sixteenth century, we shall probably find it the most suggestive method of inquiry to glance at the leading features presented by our English constitution, during the corresponding period of its growth. It would be no unworthy subject for a volume in itself to point out those among the successes and misfortunes of a nation which appear to have a cause altogether independent of the conduct of her inhabitants, and in which the interposing hand of Providence seems to be more immediately perceived. England has been peculiarly favoured by happy accidents or Providences (whichever we choose to call them) of this sort. When, after the Norman Conquest, the first William scattered his distributions of land

among his followers over every portion of England, so as to prevent as far as possible the growth of independent countships or duchies in the heart of the kingdom, he had probably before his eyes the state of England in the reign of Edward the Confessor, when the power of the great landed Thanes overshadowed and eclipsed that of the Crown, and when the family of one great Thane successfully aspired to the heirship of the Throne. The Conqueror saw, in this politic sub-division of the land, only a method of securing the authority of the Crown against the aggressions of its great vassals. He could not have imagined, what is apparent to ourselves, that by thus acting he was really laying the foundations of a state of society which would eventually create the most efficient bulwarks against the encroachments of the Crown. Unable to isolate themselves in great and independent duchies, the Barons of England were drawn together as a national council around the king, and an *esprit de corps* thus grew up among them which at once supplied that counteracting influence to the royal authority which William had endeavoured to dissipate, and supplied it, not in the name and in behalf of one great lord, but as the representative of the whole feudal array of the kingdom, and for the defence of common national interests. While Feudalism was in the ascendant, and while, through its successive links, the immediate feudal lords were the natural chiefs of the nation, the great Council of Barons fitly and adequately represented the English people. But when Feudalism decayed and other interests grew up outside its pale, when especially the policy of the Crown, and the growth of commerce concurrently with the increase of the wants of a more advanced stage of society, had raised to extraordinary prosperity the cities and boroughs, the encroachments of tyrannical princes rendered it advisable for the great barons to appeal for assistance to the mediate vassals—(the gentry)—and the middle classes of England. The loss of their possessions in France made Englishmen of these powerful lords; while the distraction of the attention and resources of the English monarchs to the recovery of the French provinces and the conquest of Scotland, gave time for the newly-formed league between the upper and middle classes to obtain consistency and

experience, and to control the expenditure of the Crown under the form of two Houses of Parliament. A national interest in national affairs was thus preserved and extended through all the influential classes of England, and a Government was established in which the House of Commons held the balance, and preserved the equilibrium between the Crown and the aristocracy without itself possessing that undue amount of power which might bring upon it the assaults of either of the other branches. Thus the English constitution grew up to a powerful maturity, and the influence of all three bodies within the walls of Parliament represented most happily their position without, until a contest for the Crown, prolonged by the suicidal ambition of rival peers, destroyed on the battle-field or the scaffold the old aristocracy of England, and left to a new dynasty a servile race of courtiers, and an indifferent and acquiescent people. From the peril which threatened the liberties of our country at that period, we were rescued by the operation of a new and unlooked-for influence. The position of the Church of England relatively to the Papal See had never been accurately defined. The Norman Conquest had been undertaken under the auspices of the Pope, but the Anglo-Norman kings had shown themselves disposed to resist the extension of the semi-temporal jurisdiction of Rome over their new realm. The opinion that the national independence was compromised by the interference of a foreign power, such as that of Rome, prevailed extensively throughout the kingdom, and ramifying through the various relations of the clergy and laity, produced an unpleasant feeling between them, which manifested itself more especially in the jealousies of the Ecclesiastical and Common Law Courts. The peculiar circumstances under which the Reformation in England gained the countenance of the Crown, connected it in its earliest stage with this principle of national independence, and enlisted with remarkable fervour in its behalf the sympathies of the middle classes, particularly in the larger cities and towns. A fresh impulse was thus given to the energies of the House of Commons, which, in the reign of Elizabeth, not only carried it, in zeal for religious reformation, far beyond the wishes of the Crown and the mere question of Papal supremacy, but renewed within the walls

of Westminster the old interference of the Lower House with the taxation and general affairs of the kingdom. Happily, though, this new collision with the royal authority did not take place until the Commons had begun to feel accustomed to their isolated position, and to learn to act without waiting for the example or countenance of the Upper House. By that time, too, the national representatives were backed by an amount of popular enthusiasm without, evoked by the spirit of the Reformation, against which the Crown, possessed of no standing army, would have found it useless to contend. Had the collision taken place sooner the consequences might have been very different; but the fortunate subservience of the earlier Tudor Parliaments to the royal wishes, had placed intact in the hands of their successors all the leading constitutional rights of the Legislature. It was a power thus called forth and thus supported, which, in the reigns of the succeeding line of monarchs, proved more than equal to an armed contest in behalf of the English constitution, and notwithstanding the seeming catastrophe of the Restoration, established firmly in the soil of this country the noble principles of civil and religious liberty.

To any one at all acquainted with the history of France, the preceding very imperfect sketch will suggest at once some of the causes of the misfortunes and ultimate failure of constitutional liberty in that country. Split into numerous really independent principalities, for a long time France existed merely in name. No national interests could be formed, for a nation did not exist. No aristocracy created the nucleus of a steady and systematic resistance to royal encroachments, for those who would have formed its members were isolated in the selfish interests of their own states. The towns, although rising into importance, and, in many instances, much more powerful and prosperous than those in England, were cut off from mutual communication, and, absorbed in their own affairs, enjoyed an independence which proved fatal to their subsequent importance as elements in the general government of the kingdom. To render France a nation, it became necessary for the Crown to conquer separately each of these great principalities; and with the fall of their independence perished also the old aristocracy. The power of

the nobility was absorbed by the Crown before the middle classes had been brought at all on the scene of action. When they began to act as legislators, they did so with all the feebleness of untried strength, and in the face of a victorious monarchy. Hence the States-General, except in times of royal minority or captivity, exercised little influence on the course of government. The only checking power to the Crown consisted in the Parliaments, especially that of Paris. These, who represented the ultimate Court of Justice, did not initiate, but exercised a power of veto on the registration of such royal decrees as did not, in their opinion, consist with the constitutional law of France. But, unpopular in their origin—being at first feudal, and afterwards royal—governed in their decisions by the maxims of the Civil and Canon Law, by their hereditary tenure of office separated from the body of the nation, and weakened in their authority by their number and mutual jealousies, the Parliaments of France proved wholly unequal to contend with the royal power. As conservative bodies, however, they took under their protection the spiritual independence of the Gallican Church; and their feelings in this respect being, of course, consonant with the interests of the Crown, they successfully maintained the liberties of the clergy against the pretensions of the See of Rome. With the restoration of the Capetian line of princes, in the person of Charles VII., and, consequently, simultaneously with the reconstruction of the French monarchy, a seal was put to these liberties, which appears to us to have had a most important effect on the subsequent destiny of the Reformation in France. We cannot do better than extract M. Ranke's account of this proceeding:—

“The Pragmatic Sanction, in which the King and the clergy then joined, must not be regarded as merely an act of spiritual jurisdiction,—it was rather the perfecting of those earlier measures by which the King, and the clergy who adhered to him, sought to counteract the influence of the Pope, who favoured the English and Burgundians. ‘Experience showed us,’ said King Charles VII., ‘that Pope Martin bestowed the episcopal sees and other important benefices of our kingdom either upon foreigners or upon such as were attached to the party of our opponent. We have therefore ordained, with the advice of an assembly of prelates, clergy, and

distinguished laymen, that no one shall succeed to a benefice in our kingdom except such as have been born in the same and are well-affected to us. The holy father who succeeded (Eugenius IV.) has also day after day conferred the benefices of our kingdom upon men unknown to us, who are not natives of the realm, and who belong to the party of our enemy.' It could not have effected much, simply to repeat this determination. In order therefore to uproot the evil thoroughly, the King made his appearance at the Council of Bâle, which was then assembled, whose decisions in favour of national churches entirely corresponded with his wishes, and satisfied all the necessities of the case. In a great assembly at Bourges, in the year 1438, at which there were present five archbishops, twenty-five bishops, and a great number of clergy of inferior rank, the decrees of the Council of Bâle were adopted, with some slight alterations, and formed into a statute, which has been designated by the solemn title of the Pragmatic Sanction. The French Church by this recovered the important right of free election; and in the present temper of the nation there was no reason to fear that it would fall upon the opponents of the King or the adherents of his enemies. The denial of the demands for money made by the Roman Curia, which Philip the Fair had once the boldness to make, could now for the first time be carried out thoroughly on the authority of a general decree of the assembly of the Church. To Rome there could be nothing more offensive than thus to settle ecclesiastical affairs without the interference of the Pope. Just as the contest in which men were engaged demanded it, all gathered themselves round the King.

"The revival of the Parliament stood in intimate connection with the establishment of the clergy in a Gallican character. The Parliament of Paris, which properly had been established by the Duke of Burgundy, and which had taken the oath of allegiance to the English king, had never been recognized by Charles VII. He had constituted his Parliament at Poitiers of such members of that at Paris as had fled to him and remained true to their allegiance, and after he had triumphed over his foe he led them back to the capital. In this he saw 'the strong arm of his justice;' and as this now renewed the ancient fundamental maxims of the French administration of justice in all respects, so did it maintain the rights in reference to spiritual affairs with which it had been invested ever since the times of Philip the Fair, and assume an attitude of defiance against the claims of the Romish Court. 'The Bishop of Rome,' said Pius II., 'whose diocese is the world, has no more jurisdiction in France than what the Parliament is pleased to allow him; it even believes that it has the power to forbid the entrance of spiritual censures into the kingdom.'"—Vol. i. p. 75.

From this moment the Roman Catholic Church in France gained, in a large part of the kingdom, a national character, and became rooted in the affections of the citizens of Paris especially, with a depth which resisted all the eloquence of the Reformers. In the reign of Louis XII. this feeling received an increase, from the free course given by that king alike to the self-government of the clergy and to the authority of the Parliament of Paris; and when a quarrel arose between Louis and Pope Julius II., we are told that "clerical contentions, *having especial regard to the Pragmatic Sanction*, mixed themselves up with disputes of a temporal character, and at last a war broke out, in which the King took up the so-called spiritual weapons, and summoned an anti-papal council at Pisa; while the Pope, on the other hand, excited all the powers of Christendom to a war against the schismatical monarch." So important had been the concessions of Louis XII., that his successor, Francis of Angoulême, and that prince's mother, Louisa of Savoy, "were both convinced that he had resigned too many of the rights of the Crown. They were in the highest degree dissatisfied with his pliability towards the Parliament, and especially with his manner of transacting ecclesiastical affairs." When, therefore, the young monarch beheld Italy at his feet after the battle of Marignano, "he hastened to Bologna, in order to conclude with the head of the house of Medicis, Pope Leo, a treaty concerning spiritual as well as temporal differences." On this negotiation M. Ranke thus remarks:—

"The negotiation with the Pope was the more significant as it affected a fundamental law of the state. It was thought in France that the King, as a conqueror, would finally bring the Pope to acknowledge the Pragmatic Sanction. Whether this was possible however is very doubtful. That law had been repeatedly condemned by the Popes, and the Gallican Church had not even thought fit to institute a defence of it at the last Council of Lateran, because it would have been condemned without question. Would Leo now, in consequence of the defeat of his allies, and in the momentary distress arising from that event, submit himself to the King, in contradiction to the conduct of his predecessors, to a council of the Church devoted to the Romish See, and against the interest of the Curia? Amongst those who attended the King, it was confidently asserted that the Pope would rather declare France schismatic anew,

summon all the powers of Christendom against the French, and throw obstacles in the way of their return to their own country. Now however the King himself had become an opponent to the Pragmatic Sanction, and intentionally committed the negotiation to his new chancellor, who also rejected it.

"And thus it came to pass that the consultations resulted, not in the confirmation of this law, as men expected, but in its abolition. The political necessity of concluding an enduring peace with the Pope, accorded with the King's desire to effect a thorough alteration in the interior arrangements of the kingdom. The agreement decided upon—the Concordat of 1516—was advantageous to the papacy both theoretically and practically—in the one respect, because it put an end to the claims of councils to an authority superior to that of Rome, as it had been confirmed in the Council of Bâle, and in the other because it restored to the Pope the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the enjoyment of the ancient revenue, such as the *annates*; but it brought a still greater accession of authority to the Crown. France then reckoned ten archbishoprics, eighty-three bishoprics, five hundred and twenty-seven abbaties; the King acquired the authority, under insignificant limitations, to nominate to all these places.

"The Pragmatic Sanction accorded with the system of moderate monarchy and the freedom of election and consultation which prevailed in France. Men were proud of the privileges which the law secured to them, and which included many corporate as well as private prerogatives. It was natural therefore that the intelligence of the abolition of that law should be received with general disapproval. The Clergy, the University, and the Parliament opposed it. The King referred the Clergy to the Pope, with whom he said they were at liberty to dispute the matter if they were so inclined. To the Parliament he declared that he would have no Venetian senate about him; that the laws and regulations upon which it insisted derived their power from the will of his predecessors, and that he possessed the same authority as they did, and might use it to ordain the contrary. When the Parliament resolved to register the Concordat, they gave it to be understood that they had consented to take that step only in order to avoid a greater evil. When they had yielded, the opposition of the University was of no account.

"The Crown, in accepting the Concordat, completely abandoned the course it had hitherto pursued. It renounced those ecclesiastical maxims which it had adopted eighty years before, on a great occasion, and steadily maintained ever since, and to which the kingdom of France had become accustomed; it made a gigantic stride in its progress towards unlimited authority. Louis XI. had already contemplated this step, but Francis I. ventured to take it

because the necessity of reconciling himself with the Pope furnished him at the same time with the opportunity and its apology. It was a reaction—probably an inevitable one—of the external relations of the kingdom upon its internal constitution.”—Vol. i. p. 124.

It is thus seen that the Gallican Church was tied up with the cause of resistance to the aggrandisement of the Crown, and that the clergy were associated with the citizens in a common bond of union in defence of their civil and religious liberties.

Such was the state of France when the first Reformers broached their doctrines within its limits. It will be at once perceived, that they were destitute of that great auxiliary to the progress of the same movement in England,—the national jealousy of a papal clergy. On the contrary the French clergy were identified in a great measure with the interests of the citizens, and in Paris they always found firm allies in the time of danger. The citizens resented the intrusion of the new doctrines, as identical with an innovation on that constitution of which the Parliament was still considered as the guardian. The civic pride of Paris also doubtless exerted much influence on the tone which her inhabitants assumed relatively to the new doctrines; both the Parliament and the Sorbonne were Parisian, and reflected glory and reputation on that city; elsewhere, different feelings produced different results. The old jealousy of Paris, and of Parisian dictation, which characterised the south of France,—perhaps, too, some dimly-perceived affinities with the old Albigensian heresy, the home-growth of the soil—procured a more favourable reception for the Reformation in that portion of France than elsewhere. On the whole, however, the civic populations of the kingdom were much divided on the subject, and therein lay one of the great differences from the position of the movement in England, and one important cause of the opposite result in the two countries. Among the gentry, and many of the nobility, especially in the south, the new doctrines were welcomed much more heartily than in the larger towns; but it is probable that this originated in an aversion to the control of the Sorbonne, and in a feeling of opposition to authority, characteristic of the high-spirited, but turbulent cheva-

liers. "The provincial nobles had," as Sir James Stephen remarks, "long cherished a deep resentment against the sacerdotal order, as usurpers of their territorial rights and seigniorial privileges." There were also other classes among which many of the new converts were found. Though the Parliament of Paris was generally strongly Catholic, this was not the case with all its members, nor with many of the members of the provincial Parliaments. Not a few of "the judges and lawyers were jealous of the encroachments of the ecclesiastical on their own forensic authority." So in the towns on the sea-coast, "the merchants had discovered that there was, in the other parts of Europe, some mysterious link between the Protestant opinions and the prosperity of trade:" and "the men of letters, whether lay or clerical, naturally turned their eyes to that quarter in which the range of speculative inquiry was enlarged, and the dominion of the human intellect extended." The conduct of the Crown was frequently very ambiguous, and there seemed to be more than once a probability of the Kings of France pursuing the same career with our Henry VIII. Their animosity, however, it must be remembered, was excited against a different enemy. It was not so much the Papal authority as the internal power of the Gallican Church, that tempted the French Princes to throw themselves into the arms of the Reformers. This disposition manifested itself in the very beginning of the Protestant movement. Master Jacob Lefevre, of Estables, who "may be regarded as the patriarch of the Reformation in France," formed an intimate association with the Bishop of Meaux, William Briçonnet.

"The Bishop of Meaux, who held similar opinions respecting the doctrine of justification, and went with him in his consequent opposition to the notion of external sanctification by works, undertook to reform his diocese in accordance with his principles, although in other respects he was greatly inclined by nature to a life of peaceful contemplation. It appeared to him intolerable that his parish priests should speak of nothing at any time but their own dues, whilst they neglected their duties, and that the chattering monks who supplied their places never promulgated any opinions except such as were directed to their own gain and advantage. He endeavoured to disembarass himself of both the one and the other,

and, in close association with Lefevre, and his disciples Farel, Roussel, and Aranda, to give another form to life and doctrine. They were roused to this attempt in an especial manner by the religious treatises of Luther, which were finding their way rapidly into France. Briçonnet was desirous of being a bishop in the right and ancient intention of the word, and he ascended the pulpit himself.

"These efforts were however destined speedily to find in France the most stubborn opposition. In Paris was the great theological university, which had always been the champion of Latin orthodoxy. The poor masters, for whom Louis IX. had originally founded the College of the Sorbonne, constituting as they did at the same time the theological faculty, had become a power in the world. On one occasion, in the fourteenth century, when the Romish Church had canonized Thomas Aquinas, the doctors of the Sorbonne renounced all variation from the Thomist system, and submitted themselves unconditionally to its doctrines, which, they declared, enlightened the Church as the sun illuminates the world. They clung to the ancient dogmata with irrefragable obedience, and declared it to be a deed offensive to God only to read a book which had not been expressly ordained to be read in the schools. Every deviation from what was usual found in them irreconcilable antagonists: they condemned Marsilius of Padua, the doctrinal novelties of the Nominalists, the spiritual ones of the Flagellants, Wycliff, and Huss: Jerome of Prague fled before them.

"During the fifteenth century, and the first part of the sixteenth, they maintained a supervision over the doctrinal opinions of nearly the whole Church, and assailed every innovation. When Reuchlin, in his dispute with the Dominicans, at Cologne, reckoned upon a certain degree of respect from the Paris University, especially as he had studied there, and done honour to the high school by his writings, he found himself mistaken: they disowned their son, as it was expressed, in order to prevent their sister, the University of Cologne, from falling. It was then to be expected that so decided an attack as Luther's upon the ancient system would most completely awaken their repugnance and wrath. As if foreseeing what would arise from Luther's movement, when his controversial writings were laid before the faculty, they named a Delegation in Matters of Faith similar to that which had been chosen at the time of the Council of Constance, on whose official report Martin Luther, because he despised the opinions of the Doctors and the decrees of the Councils, was condemned, and designated as a rebel, whose pretensions should be combated with chains and bonds, and even with fire and sword. This delegation continued, with many renewals, for more than half a century, and offered to Protestantism an oppo-

sition little less important than that of the Papacy at Rome itself. Their efficiency was owing to the fact that heresy was regarded as a civil crime; and that the Parliament, which exercised the criminal jurisdiction, held the judgement of the Sorbonne, in relation to heretics and heretical books, as decisive and final. Lefevre, already suspected on account of the Greekish tendency of his opinions, was now in addition looked upon as a Lutheran. He retired to Meaux, in order to escape being treated as a heretic; but there his activity and that of his disciples was not to be endured. The monks, who complained of the bishop, found attention to their complaints in the Parliament. The Sorbonne condemned some of the articles as connected with the innovation, which had been adopted there, and demanded their recall. The society of Reformers could not long withstand their united power—it was totally broken up and dispersed. The bishop now bethought himself that it was time for him in some measure to re-establish his reputation as a faithful Catholic, and for the rest he took shelter in his mystic obscurity.”—Vol. i. p. 191.

M. Ranke proceeds to describe the conduct of the Crown at this conjuncture.

“ Francis I. loved neither the Parliament nor the Sorbonne, with which he had a fierce dispute on account of his Concordat. The monks however he liked least of all, and had long entertained the project of founding a philosophical institution, and placing at its head Erasmus, the most distinguished opponent of their method of thinking and their manner of teaching. The religious spirit of the time did not leave the King untouched. With his mother and sister he frequently read the Scriptures, and they were heard to remark that the divine truth—which seemed to them to be there—ought not to be designated as heresy. Dr. Luther and his writings were spoken of in terms of praise at the court, and the Sorbonne lamented that the persecution of the followers of the heretic, and the destruction of his books, met with obstructions from that quarter. The supervision of the press, which belonged to the Sorbonne, was to have been restricted, but, by their intelligence with the Parliament, they held out all the more vigorously on that point. As the faculty was about to condemn a writing of Lefevre’s, the King removed the case to his own court; but the Sorbonne was not deterred from placing the writing in the index of forbidden books. The dispersion of the Reforming association at Meaux was not acceptable to the King. His sister still carried on a mystic religious correspondence with the bishop, and he himself saw no reason why Roussel or Aranda should not preach at the court.

“ Louis de Berquin enjoyed the special favour of the King. He

was, of all then living, perhaps the man who united in himself most vividly the notions of Erasmus with those of Luther. With a taunting ridicule, like the former, he attacked the disorders of the cloister and the evils of celibacy, regarding them from a religious and moral point of view, and fully exposing their corruptions; but he also showed a great esteem for the depth of the latter,—for the maxim that all Christians were priests, and an almost enthusiastic conception of the doctrines of grace and faith, and of the true church communion. The King, one time, soon after his return from Spain, liberated Berquin from the ecclesiastic prison; but he made it a point of honour not to retreat before such enemies, and considered himself able to convict Beda, the Syndic of the Sorbonne, and the leader of the delegation, of holding heretical opinions. What Francis I. might have done had the contest he undertook in Italy ended in victory on his side, we cannot say; but, as Erasmus once remarked, in a warning to Berquin, the defeat which the King suffered had weakened his authority even in domestic affairs; and when Berquin was once more charged with heresy, the royal influence was insufficient to save him a second time, and he was burned on the Place de Grève in the year 1529. The people, over whom the preachers of the Sorbonne had always preserved the greatest influence, showed less sympathy for the unhappy victim than at other times for the most abandoned criminal.

“After that the Sorbonne proceeded in a course of systematic opposition to the King. They endeavoured to cramp the activity of his college for the cultivation of the ancient languages, when it was established. They made loud complaints that the Lent sermons preached at the Louvre were not altogether orthodox. Their pupils in a scholastic comedy ridiculed the evangelical tendencies of the King’s sister, and even himself was charged not indistinctly with heresy. Francis I. on one occasion commanded Beda and his most distinguished colleagues to quit the city; but we soon find them returned back again, and engaged in their old occupations. On the next occasion the King was induced by them to take part himself in the work of suppression. Although he suffered a certain variation, yet it was within very narrow limits: neither the principle of the hierarchical orders, nor the mystery of the Eucharist, must be trencched upon. The King frequently boasted, in his negotiations with the Imperialists, that there was not a single heretic in his kingdom.”—Vol. i. p. 195.

In the preceding passage, mention is made of Marguerite of Valois, the Queen of Navarre: both our authors give an interesting sketch of her character, and a comparison of the two passages will probably convey a

true impression of the relations in which she and her brother Francis, stood to the Reformation.

"To the Venetian ambassador Dandolo [M. Ranke tells us] she appeared as the ablest person he had ever met with in France. He admires her observations on political matters as well as upon the complicated religious questions of the time. She looked upon her brother as almost the *beau idéal* of a man, and accompanied him through life with that enthusiastic admiration and sympathy which finds the satisfaction of its own ambition in the good fortune of another, and often probably came to his assistance in the transactions of government with the superiority of her calm, clear, feminine intellect, which was untroubled by any passion. Her sympathy with religion was still more independent; she wrote upon the subject: a book of hers is remarkable from the circumstance that it says nothing of purgatory or of the intercession of the saints, but speaks simply of the merits of Christ. Her religious poetry has something of an enthusiastic, we might almost say Zinzendorfish character—referring to what appeared at a later period—but at the same time a right feeling of the relation which, amid the temptations of the world, erring creatures have with the Divine Being, from whom they derive their portion of the fulness and consciousness of universal life; but *she* also confined her deviations within narrow limits, and took care not to touch the mystery of the Eucharist. Roussel, whom she had made Bishop of Oléron, proceeded in his episcopal labours in entire accordance with her views. He preached twice, sometimes three times a-day; he founded schools, and taught in them himself, for the hopes of the world appeared to him to depend upon the young; his income he divided among the poor. His religion rested entirely upon a lively conception of justification by faith, and of the invisible church. Thus the work which commenced at Meaux was carried on in the territory of Béarn, which was unaffected by the immediate influence of the Sorbonne. The Queen gave refuge to other exiles also, and Lefevre himself died in her neighbourhood. It was at last one of the greatest pleasures of her retirement to search the Scriptures, and endeavour to comprehend their meaning, in the society of friends like-minded with herself; and this practice she continued till she felt the approaches of death. She believed that she had been forewarned of her dissolution by an apparition, which showed her a bunch of flowers, with the word Soon."—Vol. i. p. 201.

"That lady [says Sir James] holds an eminent place in the history, both of the literature and of the reformation of her native land. Every one will, indeed, gladly cherish the disbelief of her authorship of the

collection of Tales for which she is celebrated; for they egregiously violate the delicacy of her sex, and the decencies of society. Or, if the evidence on which they are ascribed to her pen should be thought irresistible, let us not refuse to her memory the excuse afforded by the manners of her times; nor forget how nobly the fault was repaired by the sanctity of her later writings, and by her generous protection of all who in her days were persecuted for conscience' sake.

"She was the only sister, and the cherished friend, of Francis I.; but it is difficult to say to which of the conflicting creeds of their generation either of them was really attached. Francis, indeed, was a worshipper of the idol 'Glory.' He sought to propitiate that capricious power by many costly offerings—by eclipsing the achievements of Charles V.—by rivalling the splendour of Henry VIII.—by combining all the majesty of the first of European kings with all the gallantry of the first of European gentlemen—and by a munificent patronage of letters and of art. Yet *le Roi Chevalier* was rather a great actor, than a great agent, in the affairs of the world. His principles of conduct were continually overborne by the gusts of his transitory passions: and, both in the religious and the political controversies of his times, he changed his position and his alliances with the promptitude and the fickleness characteristic of all such unruly emotions. Marguerite, on the contrary, although her own personal belief seems to the last to have been unsettled, was inflexible in her zeal for the defence of the persons and the doctrines of the Reformers. Sometimes her influence with Francis arrested his severities towards them, and sometimes his influence with her prevented her acceptance of their opinions. Many years of their lives were passed in this affectionate contest, which seems to have cemented, instead of diminishing, the love which they bore to each other. Ill fared it with any who, presuming on the superstitious weaknesses of either, dared to bring that affection to any hazardous test.

"Thus Marguerite, having introduced several reformed preachers into the pulpits of Paris, the whole clerical body of the city revenged themselves against her for the insult. At the College of Navarre, the monks exhibited a play, in which she underwent a metamorphosis from a student of the Bible into a dæmon enveloped in flames. The more serious Sorbonne promulgated a decree, censuring her writings as heretical; and a Cordelier had the hardihood to recommend from his pulpit that she should be tied up in a sack and thrown into the Seine. Monks, doctors, and cordeliers were instantly sentenced, by the indignant King, to humiliating punishments; though scarcely had his wrath been appeased by their sufferings, when his passions veered round to the precisely opposite quarter."—Vol. ii. p. 79.

After what has been said of the disposition towards the Reformers exhibited by Francis, the following terrible narrative comes upon us as a startling surprise; it shows, at least, that the King was not very dissimilar in his fickleness, or in his remorseless cruelty, to his friend and rival, Henry of England. We quote from Stephen, in preference to Ranke, who gives throughout far too favourable a portraiture of Francis.

"The day-dream of the life of Francis was the conquest of the Milanese. An alliance with the Tuscan and the Papal Courts appeared to promise the fulfilment of that hope; and such an alliance might, as it then seemed, be cemented by the marriage of Henry, the eldest son of Francis, to Catherine of Medici, the niece of Clement VII. That Pope having arrived in person at Marseilles, Francis, therefore, hastened thither to conclude with him this double compact, nuptial and political; and then, animated with a new zeal for the Papacy, he returned to Paris, to gratify the unfortunate monks, doctors, and cordeliers, by silencing their opponents, and dispersing their flocks. The Reformers did not endure these wrongs with their accustomed equanimity. In an evil moment they covered the walls of Paris, and even the door of the royal chamber, with placards containing unmeasured invectives against the mass, and the other observances and doctrines peculiar to their antagonists. Such an outrage on his religion and his person kindled an unquenchable fury in the soul of Francis, who commanded the immediate seizure and persecution of all the heretics; and either arranged, or assented to, a religious procession, which was designed to enhance the solemnity of his proceedings against them.

"In most countries fêtes are but the idle pastimes of an idle day. In France it is often otherwise. The Fête of Paris, of the 29th January, 1535, was as momentous in its results, as it was imposing in its ceremonial. In the midst of a countless assemblage, thronging every street and house-top, appeared the King, preceded by all the sacred relics of his capital, and by all the ecclesiastical dignitaries who bore them, and followed by the princes of his blood, and by the various councillors and courts, guilds and companies of the city. Mass had been sung, and a royal banquet had been served, when, ascending his throne in the presence of his people, Francis solemnly announced his resolution to punish all heresy with death, and not to spare even his own children if they should be guilty of it. 'Nay,' he exclaimed, as he raised aloft his arm, 'if this hand were infected with that disease, this other hand should chop it off.' Such words, from such a speaker, were not

addressed in vain to such an audience. I advance reluctantly to the close of the narrative. The festivities of the day were ended by suspending six heretics from as many beams, which turned horizontally on a pivot, in such a manner that the revolutions of each beam brought the sufferers, one after another, over a furnace, into which they were successively plunged, until, by repeated immersions in that bath of fire, they were all at length destroyed. On that hideous spectacle Francis himself deliberately gazed. The people of Paris, maddened by this taste of blood, gave way to a ferocity which, during five successive reigns, scarcely ever ceased to offer new victims to Moloch in the name of the Prince of Peace. From this era, their fierce and unrelenting hostility to the Reformers takes its commencement. The fanaticism which was then aroused was satiated, at the distance of twenty-seven years, by the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

"But, notwithstanding his domestic and political alliance with the Pope, Francis had concluded with the Protestant League, at Smalcalden, another confederacy, of which the object was the depression of the House of Austria. The intelligence of the persecutions of their brethren at Paris excited the liveliest resentment amongst the members of that league; and they indignantly intimated to Francis their purpose of making common cause with the emperor against himself, as the deadliest enemy of the faith of the Reformers. To avert the displeasure of his German allies, Francis made concessions, promises, and apologies. He assured them that the victims of the Fête of January, 1535, had been punished, not for their religion, but for their offences against the State; and, availing himself of the ever-ready weapon supplied by the disunion of the Reformers, he added the assurance that they were not Lutherans but Sacramentarians.

"This defence of the recent atrocities of Paris was read at Basil, by John Calvin. To defend his persecuted brethren against the calumnies of their persecutors, he published, in August, 1535, his 'Christian Institutes.' It announced to the world that the Reformation in France had at length found a leader and a head."—Vol. ii. p. 81.

Driven from Paris by the doctors of the Sorbonne, John Calvin, of Noyon, like Lefevre, a Picard, passed into Poitou, thence in 1534 to Basil, and thence, at the invitation of the Reformer Farel, to Geneva. Here he founded that celebrated school which has subsequently exerted so extraordinary an influence on the destinies of the world. It is unnecessary for us to enter upon any detailed account of its merits and defects, but there are one or two of its features which we must allude to, as they

had an important bearing on the course of events in France. The system of Calvin was not a mere scheme of pulpit instruction, it was a vast social organisation, based on certain principles of Theology, but extending through every particular of daily life: the religious creed—the philosophy—the domestic relations,—the personal character of its adherent, were all modelled on a prescribed plan: his political preferences were also in a great degree determined for him. It must have been at all times difficult to assimilate the social Republicanism of Geneva with the loyalty of the French gentleman to an absolute Prince: it was still more so, to transfer to the careless and joyous chateaux of France the rigid morals of the capital of European Protestantism. Hence, the alliance between the Princes of the House of Bourbon, and the Calvinistic Huguenots, was always forced and unnatural. And the gay cavaliers, who scrupled not to indulge in all the excesses of a licentious age, were very unfit companions for the stern pupils of the great Reformer, and probably tarnished and weakened the cause of Protestantism by their personal conduct, much more than they aided and cast lustre on it by their heroic gallantry. The union of the *Consistoriaux* (as the rigid Calvinists were called), and the *Gentilshommes* in the same ranks, “was formed at a grievous detriment to the severer virtues, by which the early Reformers had been distinguished. It is the testimony of a writer of their own age and party, that the flame of piety among the Calvinists had been effectually extinguished by the dissolute and scandalous examples of their more worldly associates, and that debauchery advanced and overflowed among them, far and wide, like an uncontrollable torrent.”

Still this deterioration was gradual, and did not sensibly impair the efficiency of the party during the earlier portion of the contest. It was during the truces and peaces, so frequently broken and so frequently renewed by the craft of Catherine de Medicis, that the seductions of her dissolute court proved a more dangerous enemy to the Huguenot cause than all the armies of the Catholic League. It would be a great mistake to look upon these degenerate Protestants as fitting representatives of the Puritan followers of Coligny. In speaking of the peculiarities of any

class of men, it is the most just, though by no means the usual mode of gaining a proper idea of their character, to take first into consideration the more exalted minds and more cultivated natures among them, and not to rest our judgment of the whole upon the extravagances of some. Had this rule been followed with respect to the Puritans in France and in England, much misrepresentation might have been avoided. It may be at once admitted that there existed among them, as among all classes of men who leave the standard of public opinion for the dictates of their own minds, individuals to whom the term "fanatic" might be justly applied. But when this peculiarity of a few is taken as the representative of the permanent character of the whole, we may reasonably complain of a perversion of historical truth.

The rationale of the social features of Puritanism lies in the personal character of the religion which it inculcated. Though a member of an organized church upon earth, the relations between God and the mind of the believer were immediate and most intimate. The belief in an overruling and constantly-supporting Providence was intense. The efficacy of prayer, not merely as a beneficial exercise for the human mind, but as the appointed means for obtaining the aid and favour of God, was universally acknowledged. These feelings, it will be at once seen, are not necessarily those of Puritanism alone; they belong to human nature, and might be called forth at any time, by the operation of a variety of causes. Indeed, this seems to be the distinction which we are called upon to make:—The events which created and gave a peculiar colour to Puritanism are those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: the principles which lie beneath its outward features are those of all time. Calvinism itself, which is, historically, a feature of Puritanism, is, theoretically, such only so far as its tenets are a development of this great principle of the personal and spiritual relations between God and man. As a political movement, Puritanism is broadly distinguished from the Democratical theories of modern times. The Puritan commonwealth was built up on the feeling of one great authority for human action. This, which is the soul of Puritanism, stands in striking contrast to the utter want of any such

standard which characterises and is the bane of Democracy. There is a sense of permanency and reality in great principles in the former, a deficiency in which is the cause of the greatest errors which, in history, are associated with the name of the latter. That there is such a thing as Truth and Right, and that the road to its attainment on earth lies in the recognition of certain definite and leading principles and rules of thought (a conviction which results immediately from the doctrine of a personal and actively superintending Providence), is an important idea, in which monarchs, had they been wise, would have recognised a valuable ally to the idea of government. But by this, *good* government is necessarily implied; and that form was not always palatable to royalty.

The mind of the Puritan being occupied with frequent thoughts on topics so solemn and important as the above, it will not appear strange if the process going on within was written on his countenance in severer lines. But shall we attribute to a deficiency of heart that which is only the index of a thoughtful mind? And though moments of deep reflection recurred more frequently in the Puritan than in his neighbour, it by no means follows that he never relaxed from the sternness of thought into the milder duties of life. The contrary is the fact; and not even by their bitterest enemies has the possession of warm domestic feelings and the virtues of the private circle been denied to the most rigid Puritans. There was, indeed, a feeling of something better and higher, which gave its proper subordination to worldly amusements; but because he was not frivolous, the Puritan did not always cease to be cheerful and social in his pleasures. Such were the "*Consistoriaux*," the genuine French Puritans; such were the men against whom the Roman Catholic Church waged a war of extermination by the stake, by the scaffold, and on the battle-field.

The reign of Francis the First closed with a fearful atrocity. "In the year 1545 the Baron Ompeda (emulous, as it might seem, of the infamy of Simon de Montfort), under the sanction, or at least the supposed sanction, of Francis, massacred the last remnant of the Waldenses in Provence. The story of their sufferings is too shocking to be needlessly recited. It provoked a cry

of indignation from one end of the kingdom to the other ; for the religious wars had not as yet steeled the hearts of the French people to every sense of humanity. It agitated the dying moments of Francis himself, who, maintaining that Ompeda had far exceeded his orders, bequeathed to his son, Henry II., with the Crown of France, the duty of punishing that imputed transgression." But "Henry invoked in vain the sentence of the Parliament of Paris against Ompeda." Probably the invocation was not very strenuous or sincere, for the new King, unlike his predecessor, never swerved from his allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church. The Sorbonne was allowed to exercise its inquisitorial powers without restraint throughout the length and breadth of the land ; "settled the nature and degrees of error, and brought those who fell under them before the inferior tribunals, which almost always condemned them to the severest punishments. The poor people appealed to the Parliaments, which generally ordained some commutation within certain limits, leaving the punishment however still terrific ; royal edicts appeared from time to time, for the better regulation or for the alteration of the proceedings, but they were very far from moderating them in the main point. Death by fire and confiscation of goods was the universal punishment for all who felt scruples concerning the sacrament or the worship of the saints ; according to the edict of Compiègne, those also were to be put to death who brought forbidden books into the kingdom, or even circulated them." Persecution in this instance had the effect of increasing the persecuted sect. The hostility of the Crown had also, probably, a favourable influence on the spread of the new doctrines, for the misconduct of the King's favourites, not merely in State affairs, but also with respect to the ecclesiastical benefices, the presentation to which had been placed in the royal hands by the Concordat with the Pope, had been so gross as to excite general indignation. The Duchess de Valentinois, the Constable de Montmorency, and the Marshal St. André, thus became involuntary Apostles of the Reformation. "It was the era of the highest prosperity of the Reformation in France. Many of the greatest provinces and of the chief provincial capitals became, in appearance, Protestant." "In the year

1555 a congregation at Paris ventured to perform a baptism. In a short time little societies were formed in Normandy, along the Loire, in Orleans, Tours, Blois, and Angers, in Poitiers, all through Saintonge, and amongst the seafaring population of the neighbouring islands."

"In the year 1558 it was believed that there were already in the kingdom 400,000 persons who were declared adherents of the Reformation, and men were astonished at the close union that subsisted amongst them. In fact they cherished the intention of giving themselves a common organization, and carried it out shortly after at Paris, in May, 1559, in the very face of the stake and scaffold. The principle of the Genevese consistory was now introduced into the French congregations. No congregation was to have the right of interfering with another: for the care of the general interests, assemblies of delegates, conferences of synods, were constituted, according to the narrower or wider extent of their districts, and a general confession of faith was adopted.—Vol. i. p. 234.

But a more important feature of the times was the appearance, "in the year 1559, in the Parliament of Paris, of a deliberate intention to moderate the proceedings against heretics." This led to a collision with the Crown—to the personal interference of the King himself—to an avowal of Protestant prepossessions by several of the members—to the imprisonment of two of them, Du Four and Anne Du Bourg, in the Bastille, and to the execution of the latter, "a magistrate of eminent learning, and the descendant of a family illustrious amongst the magistracy of France," by the halter and fire, on the square before the Hotel de Ville, in December of the same year. But for this execution Henry II. was not answerable. On the 26th of the preceding July he had expired from the effects of a lance-wound, accidentally given him in a tournament by the Count of Montgomery. His son, Francis II., a feeble boy, succeeded him; and the government fell into the hands of Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, a member of the ultra-Catholic house of Guise.

The Guises of Lorraine, descended from Claude, second son of that René of Lorraine who fought with Charles the Bold of Burgundy, deserve a special notice. Lorraine had descended to Claude's elder brother: he himself inherited those possessions of his father which lay in

France. "These were estates scattered throughout Normandy, Picardy, Flanders, and the Isle of France, with the baronies of Joinville, Mayenne, Elbœuf, and the counties of Aumale and Guise." Claude, one of the chivalrous companions of Francis I., married a princess of the royal blood, Antoinette of Bourbon, and by her had six sons and a daughter, all highly gifted, and playing greatly distinguished parts in the history of Europe. The eldest, Francis, was the Duke of Guise who conquered Calais—"a skilful, high-spirited, irascible, and unscrupulous soldier:" the daughter was the mother of Mary Queen of Scots: the second son was Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine. His character is well drawn by M. Ranke:—

"Charles Guise acquired in his youth the scientific knowledge which accorded with the requirements of the clerical profession; he spoke the majority of living languages, and the Italians remark with admiration the excellency with which he expressed himself in theirs. Henry II. took him into his confidence at the age of three-and-twenty, and he showed himself fully equal to the management of affairs. While the constable gave offence by his severity and rudeness, Charles Guise gained favour by his agreeable and flattering address. He was elevated in early life to the Archbishopric of Rheims, and omitted nothing which a great prelate could effect to establish in his diocese an imperishable remembrance of his actions: he caused unhealthy morasses to be drained, and turned into gardens and meadows; he caused the wood for the edifices at Rheims to be felled in his forest at Joinville, and the old sentence was applied to him, that he had found a city of clay and left it of marble; he founded at Rheims a university, a theological college, a seminary, and a convent for a lay fraternity; for in no respect did he neglect his clerical and episcopal duties—he provided that the parish priests should discharge the duties of their office, he preached himself occasionally, and from time to time held provincial councils. Though the youngest of the French cardinals, he put them all to shame by his self-control and his zeal in the duties of his position. Hounds and falcons were never seen in his house, and at Easter every year he retired to some cloister in order to give himself up to spiritual exercises. He was a man of imposing exterior: his person was tall, and he was particularly distinguished by his broad, lofty, and intelligent forehead; when he spoke, all hung upon his lips,—his discourse, sustained by a never-failing memory, flowed from him intelligibly and gracefully.

"With all these various and splendid endowments, he failed in the most distinguishing quality of great men—moral elevation and

forgetfulness of self. To obtain power all means were right in his eyes, and when he possessed it he gave himself no concern about any one else in the world. He was looked upon as envious and unkind, slow in the bestowal of favours, but always prepared to do an injury,—not to be depended upon by his friends, and revengeful against his enemies.”—Vol. i. p. 246.

To this it may be added, that, physically, the Cardinal was a notorious coward. On this man, after the accession of Francis II., who, as dauphin, had married his niece, young Mary of Scotland, devolved the entire management of the kingdom. The policy of the new Government was fanatically Roman Catholic:—

“The Cardinal rested his personal authority in the State on his severe administration of the ecclesiastical law: he knew that his popularity amongst the masses would lose nothing by such proceedings: the people of Paris, imbued with anti-Calvinistic notions by the preachers of the Sorbonne, took delight in the executions. All secret meetings for religious purposes were forbidden, under pain of death to their promoters; every favour shown to an accused person was set down as a crime in itself; whoever betrayed the hiding-place of a condemned person was entitled to half his estate as a reward, but whoever should dare to protect such a person, or to conceal him in his house or strong place, against him they threatened to march with arms, and to raze his house or castle to the ground.”—Vol. i. p. 251.

At this moment the persecuted Protestants—“*Chrétiens*,” as they were then called—met with unlooked-for allies. In revising what we should call the pension-list, the cardinal had given mortal offence to several of the old officers of the army. A clamour was speedily raised against his reductions, which, it was alleged, were only rendered necessary by his Scottish expeditions, to promote the interests of his own house. Among the French nobility, great jealousy was excited against the cardinal as a stranger and an ecclesiastic. “They believed themselves justified in opposing an authority which was exercised over them under the name of a prince who himself possessed no power. It was their duty to obey those only who were descended from the royal house of France. The great King Francis had maintained the distinction between the royal princes and strangers, which it was now

sought to abolish. By princes of the true blood only would France be governed." Such natural governors existed in the persons of the members of the House of Bourbon, the next princes in order of succession. "Saint Louis left two sons, from the elder of whom descended the last Capetians and the line of Valois; from the younger, the Bourbons. Of these there were also two lines: to one belonged the Constable, in whom it terminated; to the other, his contemporary and antagonist, Duke Charles of Vendôme, who did as much for the defence of France as the Constable did to endanger it. The sons of Vendôme were Antoine; Charles, Cardinal of Bourbon; and Louis, first Prince de Condé." The eldest, Antoine, bore the title of King of Navarre, in right of his wife Jeanne, or Johanna D'Albret, "who was the titular queen of that almost nominal sovereignty." M. Ranke says of him, that he "was an amiable, generous, and well-educated man, and heartily inclined to Protestantism, but yet incapable of forming a bold and manly resolution." We think the page of history scarcely allows us to pass so favourable a judgment on his character; and Sir James Stephen's sketch appears to us, in this instance, much closer to the truth. "The chief purpose of the otherwise purposeless existence of Anthony was to exchange his empty title of King of Navarre for the dominion of some real kingdom, in any place, and on any terms. He was one of those men whose characters shift with the shifting events of each successive day, or with the uncertain mood of each new associate. With the Calvinists he would chant hymns in the Pré-aux-Clercs, at Paris; and with the Catholics he would attend a Calvinistic auto-da-fé at the Place de Grève." Of his two brothers, the Cardinal de Bourbon was of feeble intellect, incapable of being anything but a tool in the hands of others, and a bigoted Catholic. Louis of Condé, who was attached to the Protestant doctrines, was a man of considerable talent. M. Ranke appears to us to estimate his character more justly than Sir James. Speaking of his conduct at a very important crisis, the former says:—

"Louis Prince of Condé was remarkable for his versatility and enjoyment of life, he was fond of jesting and laughter, and not inaccessible to sensual indulgences, which brought him into fre-

quent collision with the severity of Huguenot morality. It was thought that, not being wealthy, the offer of a principality, which it was intended to make him, would prove irresistible, and bring him back once more to the Papacy; but they were mistaken in him: the doctrines he professed had for him an importance beyond the momentary authority with which they invested him, and he declined all the offers that were made him. There was in him a certain elevation of mind which displayed itself in a natural eloquence, that awakened the admiration of his friends; his temperament was such that difficulties and dangers were more salutary to him than a life of ease and prosperity. He would have thought it a disgrace to refuse the offered contest."—Vol. i. p. 315.

What Sir James observes may be true, that the prince "had relished the society of his Calvinistic brethren in arms very much as our Charles II. had enjoyed that of the Covenanters in Scotland;" but it does not follow, as Sir James seems to suppose, that Condé was on that account insincere in his attachment to the Protestant cause. What we can gather of his conduct seems to disprove that imputation, and it must be remembered that in volatile minds, such as that of Louis of Bourbon, the not infrequent indulgence of licentious passions is not incompatible with the existence of strong religious impressions. Henry of Navarre resembled his uncle in this among other things. We read that, when at the court of Catherine de Medicis, "Henry plunged into the very whirlpool of passion and of pleasure, when he appeared to live only for the chase, the tennis-court, and love, and those pleased him best whose folly seemed most extravagant, from time to time the religious impressions of earlier years would return; and a trusty servant heard him once, in the loneliness of the night, complain, in the words of the Psalmist, of the darkness into which he had fallen." As it was with Henry, so we imagine it to have been with his chivalrous uncle. To Antoine and Louis de Bourbon the Protestants now looked in their hour of distress, trusting to find, in their leaning towards the Reformed religion, and in their self-interest as princes of the blood, the means of overthrowing, by a *coup de main*, the Government of the Guises. "Calvin had been spoken to on the subject, but he was totally opposed to it. If he were to concede that, because the authority the Guises exercised was unlawful,

an attack might be lawfully made upon them, a requisition from the princes of the blood must first be laid before him—nay, a declaration of the Parliament against them would be necessary." The enterprise was, however, persisted in, probably with the secret connivance of the two Bourbon princes. The conspiracy of Amboise, as it was called, failed miserably, ending in the destruction of all who openly engaged in it, and in the appointment of Francis, Duke of Guise, as Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom. It led, however, to important consequences. The attempt had been avenged by the Guises by the severest punishments. Some of the insurgents "were hanged, and others drowned in the river, while eighteen military officers of distinction were decapitated with the sword, and their heads set upon poles. The old knights who had served in the previous wars were excited to madness when they came towards Amboise, and saw the heads of their former companions in arms fixed upon the poles. 'Ha!' said old Aubigné, 'they have beheaded France, the hangmen!'"

Alliances, more or less permanent, from this time forward took place between the old soldiers of the kingdom, and the persecuted Protestants; or, as they were now called, the "HUGUENOTS." This name is said to have originated at Tours, immediately before the explosion of the conspiracy: it has been variously derived. According to M. Ranke, it "at first designated a *tumultuous crowd suddenly appearing*, and may have had some connection with the tradition of the place of the wild-hunt of King Hugo." It became equivalent to our English Puritans, and as in England we had State Puritans, and Doctrinal Puritans, so in France "the Huguenots of the State were distinguished from the Huguenots of the Church." Terrified for the moment at the conspiracy, the Cardinal of Lorraine made various concessions to the Huguenots. When, however, it was found that mildness produced no change in the opinions of the Dissidents, the persecutions recommenced, and, by a new edict, given at Romorantin, in May, 1560, "the assemblies for worship were forbidden, in harsh terms, and full power given to the inferior courts for their suppression." This led to an appeal by the Huguenots, and, at the head of the appellants, appeared the future

leader of their cause, GASPARD DE COLIGNY, the second of the three sons of the Comte de Chatillon, and of the sister of the Constable de Montmorency ;—

“ He belonged to an ancient race of the high Burgundian nobility. His father had, by the side of the king, acquired reputation in war and authority in the State. After his death, which occurred early, his widow, a sister of the Constable, who, as far as can be ascertained, inclined to the ecclesiastical reformation in its most general form, made the education of her three sons the object of her life.

“ Those who viewed the brothers together were astonished at the diversity in their natural endowments. Odet, the eldest, who devoted himself to the clerical profession, and who, through his father's connection with the king, and the king's with the Romish See, was raised in his early years to the dignity of a cardinal, showed himself benevolent, generous, and amiable in his intercourse with others. Dandelot, the youngest, had a fiery disposition, which suggested the boldest schemes, and impelled him forwards to every enterprise proposed to him. Gaspard, the second, was meditative, spoke but little, and that slowly, and bestowed little attention upon others. He did not feel himself in his place at the Court, for he despised favours which were incompatible with the full consciousness of personal pride, and knew nothing of the art by which men exhibit a cordial bearing towards their enemies. He was much more at home in the camp, as Henry II. and his uncle wished, and was, in short, a thorough soldier. Here he emulated the bravest in contending for the prize of valour. He was distinguished before all others by his innate sense for discipline and the interior organization of an army ; long subsequent to his times the regulations which he established for the discipline of troops were revived and applied in practice. With the same determination, however, he cared for the condition of his troops. He compelled the enemy to carry on the war according to the law of nations, by the most impartial reprisals, and was almost terrible in his conduct towards the peasantry who laid hands on his soldiers. When besieged in St. Quentin, he drove the citizens who would not assist in the defence or in the labours of the fortification, out of the town without mercy ; and threatened the refractory with death. When, in spite of all his precautions, his chief rampart was taken by the enemy, he disdained to give ground with the flying, and coolly allowed himself to be seized by a Spaniard, whom he informed that he need not look for any further booty, as his prisoner was the Admiral of France. He has himself described this siege, not because he wished to excuse himself (for should any one complain of his conduct, he knew how to answer him as became a man of honour), but because so much

that was false had been published to the world : every one who was present at an affair was bound to rectify erroneous representations of it. His simple narrative, a memorial of historical conscientiousness, shows, at the same time, a patriotic self-dependence and strong spiritual feelings. He sees the cause of misfortunes in the will of God alone,—in that inscrutable will to which he must submit as a Christian, without attempting to explore it. His change to the Reformed doctrine is usually dated from this imprisonment. In the full occupation and tempest of war, he could hardly have found the time for attending to religious questions with that closeness which their importance and his own disposition would have demanded ; his captivity allowed him the involuntary leisure which they required. Calvin maintained a correspondence with him and his consort.

“ When he was set at liberty by the peace, he introduced by degrees into his castle at Chatillon the Protestant domestic system, an example which many others afterwards followed. He himself conducted the morning worship, and collected all who belonged to the household upon appointed days and at certain hours to hear sermons and to join in the singing of psalms ; before the administration of the sacrament he endeavoured to reconcile all whom he knew to be at enmity with one another.

“ It was not his destiny, however, to live in the simplicity of the patriarchal state, as the priest and father of his household ; he was, as a great party chief, implicated in the affairs of France and of Europe.”—Vol. ii. p. 3.

His wife was worthy of him. When, two years later, in 1562, a formidable confederacy threatened with ruin the cause of the Huguenots, she displayed a heroism of no common order.

“ Coligny understood perfectly the extent of the power which the enemy had succeeded in attaining, and the impotence of the opposite party, which had as yet no permanent form. He knew what fallings off, what misfortune was to be expected there, and what danger, exile, or, it might be, death. He asked his wife if she had sufficient firmness of soul to encounter all this, and also the ruin of her children. This lady, Charlotte de Laval, was at this moment even more resolute than the Admiral himself, for it was not, she said, to oppress others that he took up arms, but for the rescue out of the fangs of tyranny of his brethren in the faith, whose torments would not permit her to sleep. He must renounce the wisdom of the world ; God had lent him the talents of a captain, and he was bound to use them, and if he did not fulfil this duty, she added that

she herself would, when the day arrived, bear witness against him before the judgment-seat of God."—Vol. ii. p. 7.

There is, however, a reverse to this picture of Coligny, which must not be omitted—a reverse attributable to the wild passions of the times, and the stern character of the tenets of his master, Calvin.

"When Poltrot undertook to avenge on their author the suffering brought on his co-religionists by Guise, Coligny did not encourage him, but neither did he prevent him: he allowed the retribution, as he understood it, to take its course."—Vol. ii. p. 8.

Such was the man who now came forward at the head of the aggrieved Huguenots. "In the midst of its constantly increasing ecclesiastical, financial, and political embarrassments, the Court thought good to appoint a general consultation of its chief advisers at Fontainebleau; the Marshals of France, the Members of the Order, and the Councillors of the Supreme College, assembled accordingly." Coligny bore the titular office of Admiral of France, and had just rendered great services by the pacification of Normandy: he appeared at the consultation, accompanied by his uncle, the Constable, and, in the first sitting of the Assembly, (August 23, 1560,) after the King had opened the proceedings, he rose and presented to him two petitions, "from the faithful, dispersed in different parts of the Kingdom." In these petitions, the attempt at Amboise was disavowed, but liberty of worship was demanded, and the right of private judgment was proclaimed. The petitions were unfavourably received, but from that time we must date the ascendancy of Coligny in the councils of the Huguenots. We cannot follow, step by step, the vicissitudes of the years which followed. It was resolved, at Fontainebleau, to call together the States-General, and a National Council, for settling the condition of the Church. Calvin, expecting no good from either of these bodies, endeavoured to prevail upon the Bourbon princes, especially Anthony of Navarre, to make such a demonstration as would, without recourse to violence, subvert the authority of the Guises. They, on the other hand, endeavoured to anticipate the blow, and, gathering their adherents around them, sum-

moned Navarre and Condé, to Orleans, where the Court was residing, and where the Estates were about to assemble. They obeyed, and Condé was immediately arrested, while the life even of Navarre is said to have been threatened. Exactly at this crisis the feeble King, Francis II., suddenly died, the power of the House of Lorraine fell, and the government was divided between Anthony of Navarre and the Queen-Mother, CATHERINE DE MEDICIS.

Many, and widely different in their results, have been the speculations of historians, respecting the character of this remarkable woman. One great subject of controversy has been, whether she were really a bigoted Catholic, or wholly indifferent as to religion. Notwithstanding Sir James Stephen's opinion in favour of the former supposition, we cannot but think that the weight of evidence goes the other way; at least, we do not see how, with the facts which we possess, we can recognise in the actions of Catherine the predominant impulse of religious zeal. We believe that the aim of Catherine's policy throughout, tortuous and contradictory as it appears, was the aggrandisement of the royal power at the expense of every other. The Venetian Ambassador gives one of the best, though too favourable a sketch of her personal character. We quote from "Von Raumer's History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." The Ambassador, Carrero, is writing in the years 1569-70:—

"The queen-mother, Catherine of Medicis, is in her fifty-first year, yet bears no visible marks of age or weakness; she is, on the contrary, very lively, of strong bodily constitution, and so strong on her feet that it is difficult to keep up with her. This great movement creates hunger, which occasions her majesty to eat not a little, and all kinds of things confusedly. Thence, as the physicians believe, arise severe sicknesses, which bring her to the verge of the grave. In accordance with the genius of her ancestors, the queen would fain leave a recollection of herself to posterity in buildings, libraries, collections of art, &c., yet she has been obliged to lay all these things aside and employ herself with others. She is an affable, agreeable princess, courteous to all, and studies to satisfy everybody, at least with words, which she lavishes with singular liberality.

"In business she is so admirably diligent, that not even the smallest affair takes place, or is treated of, without her interven-

tion. She scarcely eats or drinks, nay, scarcely sleeps, without having some storm of business assail her ears. Thus she does in peace and war what is the duty of men to do, but is nevertheless not loved in the kingdom. The Huguenots, namely, thus complain: Catherine amused us with fair words and deceitful show of friendship, while she was, in fact, in an understanding with Philip II., and was forging intrigues for our destruction. The Catholics, on the other hand, maintain: if the queen had not favoured the Reformers, and exalted them, they could never have achieved what they have.—It is, moreover, now a time in France, when every one arrogates to himself what he pleases and boldly demands it; but, in case of refusal, cries out, and thrusts the blame on the queen. Many also think that, even if she, as a stranger, give them all they ask, she yet gives nothing of her own. Every resolution which misbefel, in peace or war, would be laid to her, as reigning uncontrolled without council or associate. I say not that the queen is a sybil, who cannot err, or who has never trusted too much to herself, but I ask what prince, how wise and experienced soever, would not be put out of his way, in case he should find himself suddenly involved in a war, in which none could distinguish friend from foe, and no aid was to be discovered all around except from persons engaged in party and seldom trustworthy? If the wisest of princes might well, in such complicated circumstances, have committed an error, I cannot but be surprised that a timid woman, a foreigner, without confidential friends, almost excluded from the truth, and not even standing at the head of the Government, should not have altogether lost her head, and given over the realm to ruin. She alone has sustained the little majesty of the crown which remains, and I am more inclined to sympathize with her than to blame. As I was once speaking with her in this sense, she herself laid before me in detail the difficulties of her position. I also know that she, more than once, has retired to her chamber to weep, there, however, did herself violence, dried her tears, and let herself be seen in public places with a cheerful countenance, because people drew their conclusions from it as to the condition of public affairs. She has also insensibly so set to rights the understandings of Frenchmen, that they no longer speak of her retirement, but rather all fear and wish to please her."

In the meetings of the States-General, so strong was Protestantism, that it seemed as if a confiscation of the Church property were likely to take place, and that, seduced by the prospect of the payment of the debts of the Crown, Catherine would finally close with the Protestant party. Nothing seems to have averted the storm

from the heads of the clergy, but their own voluntary offer of a large subsidy; with this, Catherine rested satisfied, for she was, probably, wise enough to see in the suggestions of Reform in every department of the State as well as of the Church, with which the plan of the Third Estate was accompanied, the foundation of a popular control over the Government, which would greatly interfere with her theory of the Royal Prerogative. M. Ranke justly estimates the importance of these proposals of the Third Estate, and the consequences to which they would have led, had they been carried out.

"In seasons of great agitation all designs tend to those energetic changes, and reforms, the notions of which having been long nourished in secret, by the contemplation and suffering of prevailing abuses, now burst forth suddenly. The significancy of proposals like those made at Pontoise by the third estate is obvious,—an alternation in the magistracy, grounded upon election; the sale of the ecclesiastical property in a mass, for the advantage of the nobility and the estates, as well as of the King; a clergy paid from the treasury of the State; the royal power limited, through the periodical assembly of the estates, every two years. All this together would have constituted France an entirely new kingdom. These projects have an analogy with those which were afterwards effected by the Revolution. The Parliaments and the clergy would have been overthrown by them in the same manner, and the third estate would likewise have drawn from them the chief advantages; but, above all, the nobility would not have been abolished, but strengthened. The movement did not spring from a negative philosophy, but from Protestant principles: not that these would have required so total a change in the form of the State—the example of England shows how little this is the case; but from the coincidence of financial disorders and of a universal political fermentation with the religious tendencies of the age, and the absence of authority in the supreme power, a more radical change had been inevitable in France than that which took place in England."—Vol. i. p. 290.

This indeed was the crisis of French Puritanism, and never again did it assume so proud a position. The Reformers, however, had made too forward a step at once. Their reform scheme irritated and alarmed several powerful classes:—

"It excited the opposition of the corporate power of the clergy, which in England had even shown itself favourable to such efforts;

of the Parliament, whose authority was so deeply founded in the general feeling ; and, more than all, of the great nobles, who would have been forced to surrender the possessions which, under the old constitution, they had, as they said, well acquired through their own services and the royal grace. The reforms in prospect were so immeasurable, that they terrified men's minds, and caused them to draw back from their contemplation."—Vol. i. p. 292.

At the same time a last attempt to reconcile the adverse systems failed completely. The leaders of the reformed clergy were confronted with those of the French Catholic Church :—

" At the head of the preachers appeared Theodore Beza, the friend of Calvin and of Condé, a handsome man, of dignified appearance, universal scholarship, good morals, and thoroughly confident in his cause ; the ladies of the Court remarked, with pleasure, that he knew how to maintain his position, both in jest and earnest, against the Cardinal of Lorraine. I will not say that an agreement in the comprehension of doctrine was not possible, if they had earnestly desired it ; for they came very near one another on one of the most disputed and most important points in the controversy—the Eucharist. In the commission, to which the most learned and moderate men on the Catholic side were appointed, they actually agreed to a formula, concerning the spiritual reception through faith, which was satisfactory to both parties. This formula however was not at all approved of in the great council of prelates to which it was referred, and with respect to which the commission occupied now a difficult position. The prelates proposed another formula, which the Reformed declared they never could adopt. They had however only left for the moment in abeyance some distinctive opinions ; and it is doubtful if the agreement would have continued, particularly if Calvin would have declared himself satisfied with it."—Vol. i. p. 293.

We can well believe that " Catherine listened to these debates with a secret contempt for the dispute and the disputants. She thought that they were contending about words only ; and she inferred that they would consequently rejoice to terminate their warfare by a verbal compromise."

The Reformers had found allies during these recent occurrences in a body of men to whom the title of "*Politiques*" was given. These, as far as they had any fixed views at all, seem to have taken up much the same posi-

tion with respect to the interests of the State, that Catherine assumed with regard to the Crown. Seemingly indifferent with respect to the religious disputes which convulsed the nation, they sought to shape the course of the Commonwealth between the conflicting parties, so as to preserve the constitution of the State intact, and to maintain a Kingdom in the midst of a civil war. At the head of the higher-minded among the Politiques stood the Chancellor L'Hôpital, and to his moderation the Protestants were indebted for an enactment by an assembly of Notables—

“ . . . which authorised the public celebration of the reformed worship on the easy conditions, that it did not take place within the walls of any fortified city—that the worshippers did not assemble in arms—and that they permitted the attendance of any officer of the Crown who might require to be present. On the other hand, it was provided that the Huguenots should restore the churches which they had usurped, and that they should not give scandal to the Catholics by breaking their images or crucifixes, or by any similar outrage. This law was called the Edict of January, 1562. It was willingly registered by the Parliaments in the south and west of France, and peremptorily rejected by the Parliament of Dijon. The Parliament of Paris at first refused to accept it, and accepted it at last only in obedience to repeated and positive commands from the king, and not even then without a protest that they did so in submission to necessity,—without approving the new opinions,—and awaiting the time when it might be possible to make other and better arrangements on the subject. By the Huguenots themselves, the Edict of January, 1562, was received with gratitude, or rather with exultation. Except that they were still excluded from public preaching within the fortifications of walled towns, they had at length, by many grievous sufferings, acquired whatever was necessary to the freedom of their worship, and to the diffusion of their doctrines. For such a victory they rightly judged that the lives of their martyred brethren had not been an excessive price.”—*Stephen*, vol. ii. p. 108.

The publication of this law led to the massacre of Vassy and the commencement of the wars of religion. The Constable de Montmorency, jealous of the increasing power of the Huguenots, had joined in what was called “the Triumvirate” with the Marshal St. André and the Duke of Guise. They now won over the fickle King of Navarre

to their cause, and together they threatened the complete destruction of the Reformers. This end they further endeavoured to ensure by "a traitorous treaty with Philip II., of Spain, by which they bound themselves to concur in the introduction into France, and in the employment there, of the forces of Spain, for the extermination of heresy." At Vassy, the Duke of Guise fell on the unarmed Huguenots, slaying many and wounding still more. In vain Condé appealed to the queen against this atrocious violation of the new enactment. Catherine would willingly have crushed this new league which threatened the Crown as much as the Huguenots. But Guise had entered Paris in triumph amidst the acclamations of the citizens of that Catholic metropolis, and when the queen-mother wrote letters (which still remain), imploring Condé to take the children, the mother, and the kingdom under his protection, and to save them from those who wished to ruin all, Guise anticipated the Prince, and, seizing the Royal Family at Fontainebleau, carried them to Melun and Vincennes, where they were detained in a gentle but well-guarded captivity. Thus once more the House of Guise reigned paramount in France, and for the Protestants nothing was left but an appeal to the fortune of war.

The Civil Wars divide themselves into three distinct periods—"The first," according to Sir James Stephen—

"... would embrace the ten years which elapsed between the seizure of Orleans by Condé, in 1562, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in 1572—years memorable for the too successful treacheries of Catherine de Medici. The second period, commencing from that fearful tragedy, and terminating with the assassination of Henry III. in August, 1589, would exhibit the triumph and the fall of the great commander of the League, Henry, the second Duke of Guise. The third period would be that of the gallant struggle of Henry IV. against the Leaguers and their foreign allies, and would conclude with his purchase of the Crown of France by the abandonment of the faith to the defence of which his life had been so solemnly consecrated, both by his mother and by himself."—Vol. ii. p. 115.

The events which characterized these wars are so well known that it is needless for us to enter upon them. Though M. Ranke has thrown new light on particular

points, the leading features of the contest have been long patent to all students of history. With the Massacre of St. Bartholomew ended the most glorious, though not the most successful, portion of the career of the French Puritans. The pureness of their cause, sustained with unwavering devotion and unshaken perseverance amidst the worst calamities by the genius of Gaspard de Coligny, after his death suffered a sensible deterioration. Henry of Navarre had indeed many eminent qualities, but they were little in harmony with the position in which he found himself placed. If the high-minded Jeanne of Navarre, who presented her son to the dispirited Protestants as their future leader, could have inspired into his breast her own elevated conceptions of duty, the fate of the Reformation might have been very different, and the history of France have presented a much more pleasing theme. But Henry, though a Protestant by education and early impressions, was a Bourbon king by nature. On the other hand, the cause of the Catholic League was upheld and rendered finally victorious by the resolution of the citizens of Paris and the fidelity of the House of Guise. Exactly when the fire of religious zeal was dying away among the Protestants, it blazed forth with double fury among the adherents of the old religion. The character of Henry, the second Duke of Guise, was eminently suited to the crisis at which he appeared. At another time, so restless and proud a spirit would have spent itself in vain attempts to break through the restraints of regular Government. Here, however, it found its natural sphere of action, and equal to every emergency, undaunted by any danger, it displayed the rare combination of the zeal of the Fanatic with the practical and cool sagacity of the Statesman. Compared with the "King of the Barricades," Henry of Navarre appears in his true character of the legitimate monarch, and the errant knight, in short *le Roi Chevalier*. Destitute as the former was of the nobler motives of Coligny, and the slave of an overweening ambition, still it is impossible not to feel that had Guise instead of Navarre led the cause of the Reformation, the Protestants of France might never have been compromised into a merely and doubtfully tolerated sect.

It is hardly too much to say that the cause of the

French Puritans ceased to exist when the extinction of the race of Valois rendered Henry of Navarre the legitimate successor to the throne of France. From that moment it became the interest of Henry to sacrifice his friends, in order to become the recognised king of his enemies. It became also the interest of the *Politiques*, and that large body of men who were indifferent as to all religions, to persuade him to pursue this course. As long as the House of Valois existed, it was the interest and policy of that line of princes to balance and preserve in a somewhat equal position the two religions. There is evidence to show that the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was but part of one great drama; and that the other part, which Henry III. afterwards endeavoured to play out, was the similar destruction of the House of Guise. But, on the death of that prince, the Huguenots found themselves exposed to the chances of a combination against them among all the other parties. The safety of a great cause rested on the fanaticism of a few adherents of the Spanish King, which might hinder the acknowledgment of an excommunicated Monarch, and on the fidelity to his faith of that Monarch, in the midst of every possible temptation to a contrary course. The succession to the throne of France had become a primary object; the cause of the Reformation sank into comparative obscurity. If few now cared to persecute its adherents, fewer still cared to sacrifice fortune at its shrine. French Puritanism perished, by becoming the party of Legitimacy; the religious fanatics of Paris were seemingly defeated, but, in the hour of defeat, they found present security, and laid the foundations of future victory. The revocation of the edict of Nantes consummated the fall of the first race of French Protestants; but, with the apostasy of Henry of Navarre, the French Puritans disappeared as a party in the State; with them, disappeared the last chance of constitutional liberty for monarchical France. The triumph of Henry of Navarre was that of Catholicism, and of absolute Monarchy: he became a Catholic King, and he crushed the Republican spirit of Catholic Paris. With the preachers of the Sorbonne, was banished the spirit of resistance to the Crown which they had evoked; the Catholic party became that of absolute monarchy; the Huguenots ceased

to be a party at all. Thus disappeared, at the same time, the guardians of Civil and Religious Liberty. There needed but the genius of a Richelieu, and the cunning of a Mazarine, to render complete the triumph of Despotic Rule.

ART. VI.—HIPPOLYTUS AND HIS AGE.

Hippolytus and his Age; or, the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus: and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity compared. By Christian Charles Josias Bunsen, D.C.L. 4 Vols. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1852.

Ὡριγένους Φιλοσοφούμενα, ἡ κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος.
Origenis Philosophumena, sive omnium hæresium Refutatio; e codice Parisino nunc primum edidit Emmanuel Miller. Oxonii: e typographeo Academico. 1851.

IN the year 1842 a Greek scholar, Mynoides Mynas, was commissioned by the French government at the instance of M. Villemain—then, we believe, Minister of Public Instruction—to explore the manuscript treasures which lay buried in the conventual recesses of Mount Athos. Among other works which he discovered—including the Fables of Babrius and two treatises by Galen and Philostratus—was an anonymous MS. on cotton paper, apparently of the fourteenth century, containing fragments of a ‘Refutation of all Heresies.’ For some time this work attracted little notice, but was quietly deposited with others derived from the same source in the National Library at Paris. M. Miller, its present editor, an officer attached to that noble institution, on looking into the manuscript, became at once aware of the deep interest which attached to it; and having extracted out of it some Pindaric and other lyrical fragments, which he forwarded to his literary friends in Germany, was strongly urged by them to publish the entire work. In 1850 he offered his transcript of it to the Delegates of the University Press at Oxford, who liberally undertook its printing and publication, and gave it to the world as a long-lost treatise of Origen*.—Such were the circumstances attending the first appearance of a work, which has been the immediate occasion of the four volumes recently issued from the press by the Chevalier Bunsen.

* Milleri præfat. in Origen. Philosophum., v. vi. Bunsen, i. pp. 7, 8.

This last very remarkable production we hardly know how to describe. It is not so much one work as a collection (*Syntagma* would have been the word two hundred years ago) of several works, having each a different object and written in part at different times, but all pervaded by a common unity of thought and aim, and bearing with more or less directness on the great religious questions of the day. A critical examination of the fragment ascribed to Origen, is made the centre of a wide circle of kindred inquiry and speculation, into which the learned author has gathered up the results of his studies for thirty years, with all the thoroughness and somewhat of the prolixity which belongs to the scholastic mind of Germany. Reserving to a future occasion the expression of our respectful dissent on particular points, we desire thus early to offer him our hearty thanks for the large and catholic spirit in which he has executed a task of no little difficulty and delicacy—for the manly honesty with which he has given utterance to his convictions without fear of offence in any quarter—and for the rare union which his book displays, of philosophic freedom and boldness with great depth and tenderness of Christian feeling. The first volume, which he distinguishes as the 'Critical Inquiry,' is occupied with a discussion in five letters to Archdeacon Hare, of the authorship and contents of the Greek work edited by M. Miller. In the second, entitled the 'Philosophical Research,' are contained a series of aphorisms on the 'History and Philosophy of Religion,' followed by some critical disquisitions on the life and doctrines of the ancient Church, more particularly in the age of Hippolytus, to whom, as we shall presently see, and not to Origen, he thinks the anonymous fragment ought to be assigned. The third, or the 'Life of the Ancient Church, in Education, Baptism and Worship, in Government and Social Relations,' exhibits what the author describes as the textbooks of the early Christians, or their Creed, Worship and Discipline, recovered by a critical process from the old liturgies and the so-called Canons and Constitutions of the Apostles, and contrasted in some ensuing chapters, by a sort of reflex, with the dogmas and usages of the present time. The fourth presents us with an imaginary 'Apology of Hippolytus,' supposed to be delivered by that

Father to an audience of modern theologians, asserting his claim to the authorship of the recovered work, and pointing out the prevalent misconception both by Catholics and by Protestants, of the opinions and practices of his own age. The entire work concludes with a reprint of the original text of the most ancient liturgies, restored as nearly as possible to what the author believes to have been their primitive form.

It will be seen from the foregoing summary, how multifarious are the contents of this very learned and instructive work. Every volume in fact forms a book by itself. There is, however, a great deal of repetition; as if the different parts of the work had been written at considerable intervals, and the author had forgotten, when he resumed his pen, what ground he had gone over before. By more compression and a better arrangement of its materials, the book might have been reduced nearly one-half in bulk, and the immense mass of valuable information which it furnishes, have been rendered more attractive and accessible to the general reader. In the 'Apology of Hippolytus' every one of the questions that has been scientifically discussed in the preceding volumes, is taken up again and clothed in a new form. To us, we must confess, this fiction is the least satisfactory portion of M. Bunsen's work. His mind does not seem adapted to this kind of writing. He is capable of a grave and earnest eloquence, and possesses no little depth of poetic feeling, of which several instances have struck us in the perusal of his volumes*. But he wants the lightness of hand and playfulness of manner indispensable to the style of composition which the Apology attempts. The idea which he has chosen is not a happy one; and it is carried out in such a solid and business-like way—so completely in the tone of the *bonâ fide* scientific disquisition which we have just quitted—that, except by the intrusion now and then of a disturbing word, we are hardly conscious of reading a fiction at all, and from the scholastic thoroughness with which everything is stated and argued, run some danger of accepting as historical facts what are pure figments of

* The lines in German, addressed to Rothe at the opening of the second volume—and still more those to the shade of Arnold in the third—are really touching and beautiful.

the writer. For example, where he mentions Chloe as the wife of Hippolytus, daughter of the Neocorus of the Serapeum at Portus, and speaks of his having lost a son, Anteros, through a fever caught in the house of Bishop Callistus in the Jews' quarter at Rome,—it is not till we turn to the notes, that we are fairly awakened to the fact, that this is not veritable history. We do not see what is gained in any respect by a recourse to fiction. The author had already said everything that he wished or needed to say. Scholars and searchers for truth would rather have the results of his great and varied learning in the direct and simple form; and readers of another description are not likely to be conciliated by the adoption of a style scarcely more to their taste than that of the severest criticism.

Adequately to review a work of this extent and character, would require as many articles as the different subjects of which it treats—each minute, thorough and elaborate. We have neither time nor qualifications for such an undertaking; but we think we may render an acceptable service to some of our readers, by giving them a short account of the very curious fragment from the early years of the third century, which has been recently brought to light, and still more by calling their attention to the conclusions at which a man of extensive erudition, of unquestionable earnestness, and of decidedly conservative tendencies, has slowly and deliberately arrived on subjects of the utmost importance to human virtue and happiness, after years of laborious study and of deep and incessant reflection.

The Greek work, of which the greatest part has now for the first time been edited by M. Miller, consisted originally of ten books. The first of these—the only one till lately known—had been printed among the works of Origen, though scholars of eminence long ago questioned its title to such a place; and its position here, with the marginal references of the transcriber of the later books, seems to have led the editor, rather hastily, to commend his publication to the world under the name of Origen. The University of Oxford by silently adopting and printing his manuscript, has lent its sanction to this uncritical judgment.—In the work as now published we have the first book reprinted—a fragment of the fourth (the second and

third are entirely wanting)—and the whole or at least complete abridgments of the remaining six.—The writer's extensive acquaintance with Greek learning and his own philosophic conception of Christianity, afford the only plausible grounds for supposing him to have been Origen; while on the other hand his minute knowledge of the internal affairs of the Roman Church, described in some passages with all the vividness of an eye-witness—his strong personal interest and direct participation in them, so clearly indicated in his narrative of the early career of Callistus—are wholly irreconcilable with the known circumstances of that distinguished Alexandrine Father, who visited Rome once only in his life under the pontificate of Zephyrinus, and that for a short period, chiefly it would seem from curiosity*. Whoever the author was, it is evident he must have been some one living in Rome or its neighbourhood, and intimately connected with its Christian society during the reigns of Commodus and Alexander Severus.—Two names occur as suggesting the possible author of the work in question, whose claims have been severally espoused by learned men—the Presbyter Caius, to whom, it has been supposed, we owe the celebrated Muratorian fragment on the Canon, and some other works referred to this period †—and Hippolytus.—Till lately a sort of enigmatical obscurity hung over this name ‡. Whether it belonged to an Asiatic or a European—to one whose sphere of action was at Aden in Arabia or in the vicinity of Rome—was left undecided among patristical scholars.—The researches of M. Bunsen have helped to clear up and finally dispose of this mystery. He has shown, that the former supposition originated in a false construction of a

* For this we have the express authority of Eusebius (H. E. vi. 14):
*υψόμενοι τὴν ἀρχαιότητα Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίῳ, ὅθι αὐτὸν πολὺ διατρέψας,
 ἐσάμαρτον εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν.*

† The fragments of the several works attributed to Caius, as the Dialogue with the Montanist Proclus, and the Little Labyrinth, directed against the Theodotians, have been collected out of Eusebius by Routh (*Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. ii.), who was the first to suggest the idea (*Annotat.*, p. 143) which has been since adopted by Bunsen, that the latter work should be given to Hippolytus. The fragment on the Canon, published by Muratori, Bunsen also ascribes to Hippolytus.

‡ Gieseler, for example (*Kirchengesch.*, § 63), speaks of *des räthselhaften Hippolytus*. Some scholars have fancied there were no less than three persons of this name, mentioned in Ecclesiastical History.—See Obbarius's note on Prudentius, *Peristeph.* xi.

passage in Eusebius *, and that every other monument and tradition respecting Hippolytus, proves that he must have been connected with Rome.

In the year 1551 a statue in a sitting posture (now deposited in the Vatican library) was dug up on the site of the same cemetery near Rome, which is described by Prudentius at the beginning of the fifth century, as the burial place of the martyr Hippolytus who had presided over a flock at the mouth of the Tiber. From this coincidence, as well as from the titles of works inscribed on the side of the chair in which the figure is seated, and especially from the representation of a paschal cycle adapted to the Western Church, which Hippolytus is said by Eusebius to have invented—it has been inferred with the highest probability, that we have here an effigy of the Father of that name, who is known from other authorities to have been “*Episcopus Portuensis*.”† At this time, it appears, the new port on the northern bank of the Tiber, had eclipsed in population and importance the more ancient Ostia which lay opposite to it, on the other side of the “*Insula Sacra*” enclosed within the delta of the river.—Here was the seat of Hippolytus; and here he exercised among the numerous foreigners resorting to the harbour, a sort of missionary function, which has caused some writers to speak of him as “a bishop of the nations or Gentiles”—one of the many circumstances which have contributed to mystify his history. M. Bunsen’s exact knowledge of these localities, so fully displayed in his share of the learned “*Topography of Rome*” executed in conjunction with Platner and others ‡—enables him to throw an unusual degree of light on the question of the identification of Hippolytus. We find from the “*Liber Pontificalis*,” that down to the eighth and ninth centuries the basilica of St. Hippolytus at Portus continued to be an object of interest and reverence, though the town itself

* Hist. Eccles. vi. 6. In the enumeration of different writers in this passage, the name of Hippolytus immediately follows that of Beryllus, Bishop of Bostra, in Arabia. It was hence concluded, that he must have belonged to the same region; though all that the historian says about him is this, that he presided over another Church somewhere (*ἑτέρας τοῦ—ἐκκλησίας*), and next after him occurs the mention of Caius, whose name is pointedly connected with Rome.

† Bunsen, i. p. 210.

‡ Beschreibung der Stadt Rom.

had dwindled into insignificance. "There is still," we are told, "the episcopal palace in the Porto of this day;" (from which one of the cardinal bishops derives his title) "and a tower near Fiumicino, on the spot where the branch of the Tiber is traversed, is called Torre di Sant' Ippolito."*

But another inquiry remains. What evidence is there, that the Greek fragment brought to light by Mynöides and edited by Miller, is the production of this Hippolytus? In the first place M. Bunsen has shown very satisfactorily, that all the scattered notices of *a* Hippolytus, when compared and rationally interpreted, coincide in the bishop of Portus. For the ascription to him of the work before us, he relies chiefly, though by no means exclusively, on an important passage in the Bibliotheca of Photius. (ccxxi.) In this extract a treatise on thirty-two heresies beginning with the Dositheans and coming down to Noetus, is distinctly attributed to Hippolytus, who is represented as a disciple of Irenæus. The second letter to Archdeacon Hare contains the proofs of the identity of the work described by Photius, with that which has been recently given to the world by Miller. The argument is conducted with great acuteness exercised on materials brought together by a very wide knowledge of Christian antiquity; and if on some points it strikes the mind as rather subtle and ingenious than perfectly convincing†, the preponderant impression resulting from all the evidence adduced, is very strongly in favour of the authorship of Hippolytus. As it demands high scholarship to pronounce dogmatically on such questions as these, it is satisfactory to learn, that some of the most distinguished philologists in Germany—Jacobi, Schneidewin, Lommatzsch, the editor of Origen, and others, confirm the opinion of M. Bunsen, and are even prepared to prove, that Hippolytus must be the author of the work 'against Heresies.'‡.—The objection that will obviously occur to the general reader, is this: if Hip-

* Bunsen, i. p. 209.

† As, for instance, in explaining the want of correspondence between a quotation by Peter of Alexandria from Hippolytus respecting the Quartodecimans, and any words now extant in our actual text (i. pp. 105-111). It is the perfection of subtlety in argumentation, to cite the absence of similitude as a proof of identity.

‡ Schneidewin and Duncker are already engaged on a new edition, which the state of the text renders indispensable to a more complete understanding of the work.

polytus was a bishop of the Roman Church, and treated of matters chiefly interesting in the West, why did he write in Greek? A knowledge of the facts of the case deprives this difficulty of all its force. Christianity from the first was a Greek importation into Rome. It was first preached by Hellenistic Jews. Its earliest teachers and defenders, such as Justin and Tatian, had been Greek sophists. The nucleus of the primitive congregation must have been Greek, consisting chiefly, it may be presumed, of the numerous freedmen and even slaves, who were of provincial parentage, and had been collected in the great city from all parts of the Græco-Roman world. Converts from native Romans were probably the exception; for the Romans as a race were singularly tenacious of old beliefs and unwilling to forsake established institutions—affording in this respect a remarkable contrast to the excitable versatility of the Greeks. Heathenism lingered long and died hard among the old aristocratical families of Rome. The Anicii were the first of the Senate who embraced Christianity; and this was not till the beginning of the fourth century*. The native populace, corrupted and pauperised as they were, would be little likely to trouble themselves with religious questions, so long as the baths, the theatres and the largesses of meat and wine, were preserved to them; or if they paid any heed to the subject, would probably follow the example of the nobles, and, notwithstanding their degradation still proud of their Roman blood, would spurn with contempt anything that was offered them by Jews and Græculi.—The personages of whom we catch a glimpse in the very amusing peep which the work of Hippolytus gives us into the private history of the Roman Christians, in the time of Commodus and his successors, were most of them—to judge by their designations—of Greek extraction. The names of the bishops of Rome from the earliest record down to the beginning of the third century, are with few exceptions Greek. The creed professed at baptism continued to a late period to be recited in Greek, even after it became necessary to translate it for the subject of the rite: and for a long time analogy would lead us to conclude, that in the public service the Scriptures must have been read, and the exhortation de-

* Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, ch. xxxi.

livered, and the hymns sung, in the same language. Indeed, generally, the cultivation of Latin as a vehicle of literature, appears at this time to have declined in Italy, and transplanted itself into the provinces. In the age immediately preceding Hippolytus, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius wrote his *Meditations* in Greek, and the scholars about court prided themselves on their skill and fluency in that tongue*. Greek therefore was the medium through which the deep thought of Hebrew prophets was first infused into the hard and carnal intellect of the West. Christianity spoke Latin earlier, there is reason to believe, in the provinces of Spain and Africa than in Rome itself. The mind in fact of the Western Church, and the peculiar Latinity so different from the classical, in which it learned to express itself, were formed by the example and cast in the mould of the African Fathers:—though it is confirmatory of our general view, that some of the earliest of Tertullian's works were still written in Greek†. Thus the circumstance which seems at first sight to militate against the supposition of the work on Heresies being the production of a Roman clergyman, serves upon inquiry to furnish a corroboration of that view, and tends to fix with great probability the period within which it must have been written.

We have solid ground then for believing, that in the work before us, we have a veritable production of the Roman Church at the commencement of the third century, written by one who had seen with his own eyes, and influenced by his own speech, the conflict of theological and ecclesiastical interests which were already fermenting strongly in its bosom‡. The style where it is preserved

* “Hæc Favorinum dicentem audiui *Græca oratione*: cujus sententias, communis utilitatis gratiâ, quantum meminisse potui, retuli. Amœnitates vero et copias ubertatesque verborum, Latina omnis facundia vix quidem indipisci potuerit.”—*Aul. Gell. Noct. Atticæ*, xii.

† Of the two dates assigned to the *Dialogue of Minucius Felix*, it is an argument so far in favour of the later, that the work is written in Latin; and if it be supposed posterior to Tertullian, this will account for certain coincidences of thought and expression traceable between it and the *Apologeticum* of the African writer.

‡ The Chevalier Bunsen proposes the following as the future title of the work: Τὸ ἅγιον Ἰσπολύτου Ἐπισκόπου καὶ Μάρτυρος Κατὰ πᾶσῶν αἰρέσεων Ἰλιγγιστὶ τῶν διὰ βιβλίου τὰ συζόμενα. The form is the same with that prefixed to the works of Justin Martyr.

to us in its original state, is clear, flowing and even elegant, and indicates a mind of considerable literary and philosophic culture: but the text is more or less corrupted in nearly every sentence of any length, and sometimes to such a degree, as to render all sense wholly inextricable. Only the attempt to read through a text left in this deplorable condition, can make us fully aware of our obligation to the laborious scholars who, by continually dispelling with the light of an exact grammatical, historical and diplomatic knowledge, the obscurity which the blunders of successive copyists have gradually accumulated on the meaning of ancient writings, give us an easy access to the best minds of past ages, and enable us to hold intelligent converse with them*.

To understand the value and interest of this work of Hippolytus, we must form to ourselves a distinct idea of the times in which he lived. He forms a kind of link between his instructor Irenæus who brought the theology of Asia Minor into Gaul, and Origen and Cyprian who in the course of the third century gave to Christianity a more definite shape and consistency—the former by cultivating its speculative elements at Alexandria, the latter by developing the principles of the hierarchy in the West. It was one of those critical periods of transition through which every human institution has to pass, when the discordant elements which it has taken up in its earliest process of popular evolution, work themselves off, and it

* The mistakes in the text are often so gross and obvious, that the correction of them lies patent to an ordinary scholar. M. Bunsen has occasionally restored the more difficult passages very happily. But the most striking specimens of felicitous emendation are furnished by the "Epistola Critica" of M. Bernays (appended to the last volume of M. Bunsen's work), in which he corrects the text of Hippolytus from itself. One is made to feel in reading this admirable essay, what a severe mental discipline a true philologist must have gone through; how many of the highest intellectual endowments, and how much rare and recondite knowledge converged from many points on a single object, are required for the successful reproduction and thorough comprehension of the thought of a remote age. We cannot but think, that philology in its nobler sense, as the art of exactly interpreting the monuments of the human mind, has fallen into unmerited neglect, in our exclusive devotion to physical science, and what are called the practical interests of the world; and that it must be again revived, and exercise more influence in our education and our literature, if we are to preserve among us a race of clear and vigorous intellects, and to make *reading* what it ought to be, not a passive impression, but a mental act. In estimating the intellectual culture of our time, we ought surely to take *quality* into account, as well as *quantity*.

settles down into a fixed and uniform character. In the second century the great ideas brought into the world by Christianity, mixed freely with the mythic dreams and theosophic theories of a slowly-dissolving heathenism, which encountered them in every direction.—Heathenism and Christianity had not yet ascertained their mutual limits, nor learned where they could unite and where they must separate.—The immediate result was an extravagant license of speculation, a bold intermingling of views and an intense fermentation of spirits, which filled those who clung firmly to the simple practical convictions of the primitive faith, with astonishment and dismay, and threatened to destroy the very identity of Christianity.—Unfortunately we possess hardly any records of the earlier half of the second century, when the Gnostic movement which had sprung out of the first contact of Heathenism with Christianity, was in its greatest activity.—We know nothing of Gnosticism, but from the representations of those who were most bitterly opposed to it, and from the fragments of its writers, often there is too much ground to believe, inaccurately and unfairly cited—which they have introduced into their works. A more interesting and valuable discovery could hardly be made, or one that would throw more light on the obscure and mysterious interval between the age of the apostles and that of the earliest extant apologists, than an entire production of Valentinus or Basilides or some other of the great Gnostic leaders. But the unsparing animosity of the Catholics has not left us a single specimen of these writings, except such as could answer a controversial purpose by their insertion in treatises expressly intended for their confutation. Of the fierceness of the struggle we can form some idea from the traces which it has left in the extant works of the writers who appear towards the close of this century—Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and we may now add, Hippolytus of Rome. To the deep conservative feeling engendered by this controversy in the ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ throughout the world, who looked on themselves as the depositories of the pure apostolic tradition, we owe the first decisive reduction of the church to the form in which its doctrinal and sacerdotal development commenced; and under the same influence, there is little

doubt in our minds, that the creed was first developed into ampler proportions from the simple formula of Christ, and the Scriptural canon at length definitively fixed. According to our reading of those times, the speculative outburst of Gnosticism and the reactionary conservatism which followed it, were alike inevitable—necessary and closely connected phases of spiritual life in the historical growth of Christianity.

In his review of heresies Hippolytus has followed in the steps of Irenæus, and sometimes merely abbreviated the language of his master, leaving out the declamation and giving the facts. M. Bunsen regards it as a great merit in Hippolytus above other writers against the Gnostics, that he does not content himself with representing their opinions in his own words, but gives direct citations from their works. As compared with Irenæus and others, he may indeed deserve this praise: but his own account is often very confused; he makes his quotations in the loose way so common with ecclesiastical writers; we do not always see to whom he is referring, by the vague *φησι*, or where he is quitting the extract and taking up again the statement of his own views. It is the leading idea of his book, that the Gnostic theories have sprung out of an assimilation of the truths of Christianity with the doctrines of some heathen school; that Basilides, for example, has borrowed his principles from Aristotle, Marcion from Empedocles, and Noetus from Heraclitus. For the illustration of this last very obscure writer (*ὁ σκοτεινός*) whose remains have been collected and interpreted by Schleiermacher—we may observe in passing, that this work of Hippolytus has preserved many fragments before unknown, on which Bernays has exercised his critical skill in the essay already alluded to. Hippolytus considers the heretics as nothing better than plagiarists of the heathen philosophers, and compares them to cobblers who patch up old articles after their own fancy to pass them off as new*. Throughout indeed he treats the heathens with far more respect than the heretics. His usual mode of tracing the connexion between the heretical and the philosophical doctrine, is ex-

* *Τούτων—μαθητὰς, μᾶλλον δὲ κλειψιλόγους*, iv. p. 92. *Δίῃν παλαιογράφων συγκατατίσαντες πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον νῦν τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν σφάλματα ὡς κεινὰ παρτίσαν*, v. p. 94.

ceedingly far-fetched and even ridiculous—showing clearly enough, that our good Father with all his learning, could not reason. Sometimes, when he comes to the proof of his assertion, he merely cites the words of the heathen writer over again, and leaves the reader to make out the connexion for himself. Indeed it is quite obvious in many passages, from the evidence of his own language, that he has misunderstood and misrepresented the meaning both of the heathen and the heretic. But the nature of his subject leads him to speak of opinions and practices widely prevalent in his own time; and the glimpse that we thus obtain into the inner life of society, is exceedingly interesting—far more so than the confused light which he throws on more speculative topics. He is a very fair specimen of the average culture of his age; and notwithstanding his Christianity which must still have secluded him from an enlarged intercourse with the world, we are continually reminded in his book, that he belonged to a period which produced Galen and Ptolemy. It places us in fact in the very heart of the old civilization, now verging to its decline, but still exhibiting many of the fruits of an extended system of public instruction—still preserving many of the materials and conditions of the most valuable knowledge. We see what a state of things it was, on which Christianity was then called to act, and with which it had to contend; how the life of a new world was growing out of the death of the old; and we learn most distinctly from the picture, how little the largest possession of ideas imbibed from books, how little mere skill in handling the forms and instruments of intellectual cultivation, can avail for effecting the true ends of society—when disjoined from the stimulus and responsibilities of freedom, and no longer animated by a spirit of moral earnestness. From the absence of these vital elements the learning of the old world was becoming dead lumber; while in the hearts of slaves and freedmen and barbarians a principle of new life was silently germinating, that was destined after the lapse of ages to reanimate it and weave out of it a richer and nobler form of civilization. Yet the age of Hippolytus followed closely on that which Gibbon has pronounced the happiest recorded in the annals of mankind.

We do not propose in this article to take a general sur-

vey of the Gnostic systems, even as represented by Hippolytus; but a few notices of the mental and social condition of his age, as revealed by his work—a few indications of the moral atmosphere which he breathed—may be entertaining and not wholly uninteresting. The first book which, as we have before stated, had already been printed among the works of Origen, is devoted to an exposition of the opinions of the old Greek philosophers, distributed into the three schools of the physical, the ethical, and the dialectic or logical—not without a rapid glance at the doctrines of the Bramins and the Druids. In this summary, which appears to have been extracted and abbreviated, not always very connectedly, from previous works that are not mentioned, and only in a few passages from the writings of the philosophers themselves—we are struck with the fact, how many phenomena preparatory to science had then been observed, and how many fragments of scientific truth were already known, which have only recently entered into large inductions and been generalised into laws. We find that Anaximander who flourished in the sixth century B.C., held that the earth was suspended and kept in its place by a balance of equal attractions, that it was of a round form, and that there were antipodes*. Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ, the teacher of Pericles, in the fourth century B.C., understood the cause of lunar and solar eclipses, (γῆς—σελήνης—ἀντιφραττούσης,) was aware that the moon shone by the reflected light of the sun, and that its surface was diversified by plains and hollows; knew that winds were occasioned by the rarefaction of the air through the solar heat; and seems to have had some notion of regular atmospheric currents to and from the pole†. Democritus anticipated Fontenelle in his doctrine of a plurality of worlds, scattered through space and existing in various states of physical development‡. The facts which have been so diligently collected by recent geologists, and made

* Τὴν δὲ γῆν εἶπαι μετὰ τὸν ὕπν' οὐδένος κρατουμένην, μένουσαν διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν πάντων ἀπίστας. Τὸ δὲ σχῆμα αὐτῆς ὕγρον στερογύλον. Τῶν δὲ ἐπιπέδων ᾧ μὲν ἐπιβιβάκαμεν, ὃ δὲ ἀντίτετον ὑπάρχει.—P. 11.

† P. 15. He had a strange fancy as to the determination of the sex in the womb, which is thus expressed: ἄρρενας μὲν γίνεσθαι, ὅταν ἀπὸ τῶν δεξιῶν μερῶν ἀποκερῖν τὸ σπέρμα ταῖς δεξιαῖς μέρεσι τῆς μήτρας κολληθῇ, τὰ δὲ θήλια κατὰ τὸναντίον.

‡ P. 18.

the basis of a fossil botany and zoology, were not unnoticed by ancient observers and led to cosmogonic theories, like those of Burnet and Woodward, which preceded the modern scientific school. Xenophanes, the founder of the Eleatic School, supposed that there had been a primitive paste, arising from a commixture of land and sea, out of which our actual earth was at length evolved—alleging as proof, the occurrence of marine shells in midland districts and on mountains. He had called attention, according to Hippolytus, to the impression of a fish and other sea animals which had been found in the quarries of Syracuse, and to that of a laurel in the very heart of the rock at Paros; while at Melitus he had observed, that the surfaces of all kinds of marine animals (πλάκας συμπάντων θαλασσίων) might be seen impressed. He concludes very naturally, that these impressions were left when the earth was in a state of mud (ὅτε πάντα ἐπηλώθησαν πάλοι) and had dried in it. It was his belief, that things will return once more to this state; that the earth will again subside into the sea; that mankind will perish, and there will be a new commencement of the race*. Ecphantus of Syracuse taught, that the earth in the centre of the universe, revolves on its own axis with a movement towards the east†.

The fourth book, which contains an exposure of the astrologers, exhibits more strikingly than any other part of the work, the strange jumble of the most incongruous ideas, which had been one result of the breaking up of old faiths and increased intercourse between all parts of the earth, during the first centuries of the Christian era. In the knavish tricks and miserable legerdemain here described, we behold the lowest form of that wild fusion of mental elements, of which the grand imaginative theories of Valentinus and Basilides exhibit the best fruits and the most respectable expression. There was no lack of ideas, furnished by all sorts of books and by itinerant lecturers; the public mind was overwhelmed with ideas: but there was no sifting of them; there was no principle to organise them.—It was a complete caricature of the diffusion of popular knowledge, when not guided by any system nor based on a thorough grounding in rudiments.

* P. 19.

† Τὰν δὲ γῆν μένειν κίσμου κινῆσθαι περὶ τὸ αὐτῆς κέντρον ὡς πρὸς ἀνατολήν.—
P. 19.

There was no discrimination of authorities; no regard to the laws of evidence. Conclusions were taken up at second hand and loudly vented as truths, without any appeal to facts or any logical analysis of the grounds on which they rested. Hippolytus nowhere appears to more advantage, than in the good sense and scientific knowledge with which he lays bare the ignorant and impudent pretensions of his time. It is difficult at the present day to conceive the effect produced on the popular mind, by the sudden influx of ideas from the Oriental thaumaturgy, the dreams of the New Platonism, the Greek astronomy, and the Christian theology; how Homer and Aratus and the Scriptures were used to interpret each other, and supposed to teach a common truth; and what monstrous doctrines were the result of these unnatural mixtures. Hippolytus calls the presumptuous divination in vogue, *ἄσοφον σοφίαν**;—and when we trace its revolting abominations in his pages, we can well understand, and can hardly condemn, the somewhat intense conservative reaction of the church. To the extent of his science, Hippolytus appeals to the facts of the physical universe, for the refutation of these absurdities. He discovers a considerable acquaintance with the doctrines of the older Greek astronomers, Archimedes, Hipparchus and Apollonius; and expresses his special obligations to Ptolemy, for giving him such a knowledge of the laws of the planetary system, as enables him to repel the baseless assumptions of the astrologers. He uses science as a test of truth. Should any one doubt his assertions, he asks him to make the necessary measurements and calculations, and satisfy himself†. We have in all this an anticipation of modern times, and that by a Father of the Church!—He has a strong sense of the mischief of half-knowledge, and holds that disconnected fragments of science, an imperfect apprehension and dishonest abuse of facts, have led to endless heresies; and he makes a remark, which we might profit by even in the nineteenth century, that prognosticators thrive on *one* successful hit, and are not disconcerted by a thousand failures‡.

We get an insight from this book into the domestic use

* *Insanientis—sapientiae.* Hor. Carm. i. 34.

† *Εἰ τις τούτων φάσκει ἀπιστεῖν, μετρήσας πειθήσθω.*—P. 50.

‡ *Ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀποτιύγματος μὴ αἰδοῦμενοι, ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ἑνὶ ἐγκομῇ πάντες.*—P. 50.

of the horoscope. In casting a nativity, it was necessary to mark the precise moment of conception or birth. Hippolytus shows from various scientific considerations, the utter impossibility of determining this. With regard to birth, it would seem from his account, that it was customary for an astrologer to be in attendance at the time of an *accouchement*, and to communicate the fact by the ringing of a signal (τοῦ δίσκου ψόφον) to another who was stationed on the roof of the house, that he might record the contemporaneous appearance of the heavens. Besides other hindrances to the needful accuracy of the observation, Hippolytus argues, that as sound travels more slowly than light (for in watching wood-cutters at a distance, we see the stroke of the axe before we hear it) however intently the star-gazer may be looking on the skies, some measurable interval must elapse between the point of birth, however determined, and the sound of the discus, which would render the observation for astrological purposes wholly null; and further, that as observations would have to be made on several of the heavenly bodies, their relative position must be changed, owing to the exceedingly rapid motion of the celestial sphere, between the beginning and the end of the operation*. In this same book are contained descriptions of various tricks of sleight-of-hand and ingenious deception, some of which we meet with again in the middle ages, and others we may still witness in the performances of a modern conjuror; but which in those days were strangely mixed up with religious feeling, and classed among the heresies, which a grave Christian bishop thought it his duty to confute†. Among other follies we learn it was the practice to divine the secrets of men's lives by the letters of their names, and to write out their characters—as phrenologists will give them now from the protuberances of the skull—from certain signs furnished by the stars‡. It is evident from the language of Hippolytus, that they were accustomed in those days to dissect the brain, and probably, from a reference to its coats and membranes, the eye also§. He uses familiarly the

* P. 35.

† P. 76.

‡ Pp. 56-60.

§ Τῇ τοῦ ἰγχιφάλου ἀνατομῇ—ἰγχιφάλος ἀνατμήθεις.—Pp. 90, 91. Χιτῶνα κερατοειδῆ (the cornea) ὑπὸ δὲ ταύτων κέρην βλεφαροειδῆ, ἀμφιβλεστοειδῆ, διασπαιδῆ, etc.—P. 267.

technical terms which express the cerebellum, the pineal gland and the spinal marrow, and speaks of the nerves branching off from this last (*δίκην κλάδου*) and distributing the spiritual element (*τὸ πνευματικόν*) through the whole body. From the structure of the brain, some at that time were accustomed to deduce conclusions respecting the universe and the Deity. To this Hippolytus had no objection, provided science were not abused to heretical speculations.

The fourth book discloses the lowest dregs of the Gnostic superstition: in the following, the nobler forms of speculation come under review, and here we meet with not a few beautiful touches of poetical feeling and diction, and some really fine utterances of deep philosophic thought. Fragments, too, of Gnostic hymns occur, which possess great interest as being among the earliest specimens of Christian poetry. How exquisitely the liquid lustre of a dark eye is described in this attempt of the Sethians to illustrate by it the mutual relation of their three *ἀρχαὶ*—light, spirit, darkness! *κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ σκοτεινὴν ἐκ τῶν ὑποκειμένων ὑδάτων πεφωτισμένην πνεύματι*—‘the light of the spirit shining out from the darkness of its subjacent waters.’ The little that we know of Valentinus makes us regret that we do not possess a more complete acquaintance with his system. Can anything be more beautifully expressed than his conception of the origin of the universe? ‘The Father dwelt alone, unbegotten, exempt from space and time, without a counsellor, in his own incomprehensible essence.—But since his energy was creative (*γόνιμος*), it seemed good to him at length to call into being whatever he possessed most beautiful and most perfect within himself. For He loved not solitude, being pure and absolute Love; but love is not love, unless there be something to be loved. The Father therefore put forth of himself, as He dwelt alone, Intellect and Truth, the twofold Source, the Sovereign and Maternal principle, of all the emanations which in long succession went forth from them.’ He then quits the language of philosophy for that of the myth.—‘Valentinus,’ says Hippolytus, ‘would more justly be considered a Pythagorean and a Platonist than a Christian.’*

* P. 185.—Aken-side has expressed a kindred thought in language not very dissimilar.

“Then lived the Almighty One: then deep-retired
In his unfathomed essence, viewed the forms,

A singular physiological doctrine was introduced by the Valentinians into their fanciful cosmogony, that in the process of generation, the substance is imparted by the mother, and the form impressed by the father*. In a difference of opinion between the Italian and Oriental schools of the Valentinians respecting the body of Jesus, we trace the result of two opposite conceptions of the time and mode of the union between the human and the divine, in other words, between Jesus and the Christ—each of which has been retained in the statements of our canonical Gospels, though they were originally distinct and independent, and are in fact inconsistent. The former headed by Heracleon and Ptolemy, held that the body of Jesus was from the birth *psychic* or natural, and that the spirit which made it divine and raised it from the dead, was united with it at the baptism; whereas the latter, to which Axionicus and Ardesianes belonged, supposed that from the first it was *pneumatic* or spiritual, in other words—which is the doctrine of the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke—that it was fashioned (διαπλασθῆ) by the Divine Spirit in the womb of Mary†. An opposite view of the cosmogonic problem to that adopted by Valentinus, is thus expressed with considerable depth of philosophic thought, by Hermogenes, a Carthaginian painter mentioned by Tertullian: ‘God formed the universe out of matter that was increate, and co-eternal with himself; for he could not form it out of the non-existent: but God and matter eternally stand to each other in this relation; God is the ever sovereign and formative principle (ἀεὶ κύριον καὶ ἀεὶ ποιητὴν), and matter through subjection to Him, is in a continual state of growth and development (ἀεὶ δοῦλὴν καὶ γινομένην).’‡ The use of the present tense indicates the great and fruitful idea of a continuous creation in constant dependence on God. It is often curious to

The forms eternal of created things;
 The radiant sun, the moon's nocturnal lamp,
 The mountains, woods and streams, the rolling globe,
 And wisdom's mien celestial. From the first
 Of days, on them his love divine he fixed,
 His admiration: till in time complete,
 What he admired and loved, his vital smile
 Unfolded into being.”—*Pleasures of Imagination*, Book I.

• P. 167.

† P. 195.

‡ P. 273.

trace in these ancient books, an anticipation of later forms of doctrine. Some of the Theodotians, who were the strict Unitarians or rather Humanitarians of that day, regarding Jesus as in nature a simple man, and supposing the Christ to have descended on him in baptism, conceded to him, notwithstanding, the name and character of God after his resurrection from the dead*. This was afterwards the characteristic belief of the Polish Socinians.

The ninth book which completes the survey of heresies, treats of those which were contemporary with Hippolytus himself. Of these the principal was that of Noetus of Smyrna, which was brought to Rome in the episcopate of Zephyrinus in the opening years of the third century (201-218 A.D.), and strenuously resisted by Hippolytus. This last circumstance deserves notice, as fixing the age of the author of the book, and as showing that he was intimately connected with the Roman Church. This part of the work is exceedingly valuable for the light, so rarely attainable, which it lets in upon the private life of the Christians of that day, containing, it must be confessed, what M. Bunsen calls not inappropriately a *chronique scandaleuse* of the Church of Rome.—It is indeed the very reflex of our own time. We learn from it plainly enough, that the Christians of the third, were very much like the Christians of the nineteenth, century, exhibiting the same mixture of good and evil elements; that there were then as now, clever knaves who worked their way by professions of religious zeal to the high places of the earth, and well-meaning but weak and simple people, who lost their money and their temper from connexion with them. It shows us how possible it was, even in that early time, a century before Christianity was adopted by the State, for a bad man by successful villany to become bishop of Rome.—The facts were simply these.

There lived at Rome in the reign of Commodus, a Christian named Carpophorus, who held some office in the imperial household. Carpophorus had a slave, also a Christian, who was called Callistus. From the confidence that he had in this man, strengthened no doubt by religious sympathy, Carpophorus set him up as a banker, and entrusted him with a considerable capital, hoping at once to serve his domestic,

* P. 258.

and to get a fair return for his money. Thus furnished, Callistus took what we should call in modern phrase, a *comptoir* (τράπεζαν) in the Piscina Publica, a celebrated quarter in Rome, and commenced business. Relying on the supposed security of Carpophorus who was wealthy, many widows and others among the Christians deposited considerable sums of money with Callistus. These however soon disappeared, and the concern got into difficulties. When this reached the ears of Carpophorus, he insisted on seeing the books; and Callistus, afraid to face his master, ran off to Portus and embarked on a vessel which he found in the harbour just ready to sail. Thither he was pursued by Carpophorus, for it is evident that there was at that time a Fugitive Slave Law in Rome; and when Callistus saw his master on the quay, he knew it was all over with him, and in a fit of desperation threw himself into the sea. He was picked up, however, by the boatmen who were coming to fetch him, and handed over to Carpophorus who took him back to Rome, and lodged him safe in the domestic treadmill, or *pistrinum*.—The whole of this transaction is narrated so graphically, that we can hardly doubt, Hippolytus, the bishop of Portus, was standing by his Christian friend all the time on the quay, and was an eye and ear witness of the noise and confusion attending the recapture of Callistus. But there were soft-hearted people in those days like the present, who had a special sympathy with criminals; and divers of these came and interceded with Carpophorus for the prisoner, who had assured them, they said (the event showed, it was an impudent lie) that he had outlying moneys due to him, if he could only be at liberty to go and get them in. The good and kind Carpophorus yielded, the more so because he was daily beset by the ruined depositors, who told him with tears, that they had lost their all from relying on his credit. His own loss, he said, he did not mind, but he was concerned for them. Callistus was, therefore, set free for this purpose; but, as he was closely watched, he had no opportunity of making his escape. At length he bethought him of an expedient for getting up a reputation and improving his fortunes. He went out one Sabbath morning, pretending he was going to hunt up some people who owed him money, and made a

great disturbance in the Jewish synagogue during the time of service. The Jews, justly indignant, laid hold of him, and carried him before Fuscianus, the prefect of the city, charging him with having interrupted their worship, the free exercise of which (as theirs was a *religio licita*) had been granted them by the Romans. Fuscianus took up their cause warmly; and in the meantime Carpophorus having heard of the occurrence, hastened to the court, and besought the magistrate, not to believe Callistus, as he was no Christian, and was only devising some means of being sent with *éclat* out of the world (*ἀφορμὴν δὲ ζητεῖ θανάτου*). These are singular words, but they throw light on the character of many among the lower order of Christians of the time. There can be no doubt, notwithstanding his master's disclaimer, that Callistus had ^{been} ~~posed~~ himself a Christian, and having lost his character, was desirous to retrieve it by making himself a martyr. There was probably a mixture of roguery and fanaticism in his feeling. Martyrdom was already at a premium; and the terms of admission to future blessedness were by many, no doubt, greatly misunderstood. His recklessness of death on this and on the former occasion, as a less evil than living dishonoured on earth, bears witness to the perverse and bewildering strength with which the belief in immortality had seized the minds of less advanced Christians, and of which about a century later, Augustine has recorded still more stupendous instances among the fanatics of Africa.

Nor was Callistus altogether wrong in his view of the case, though Hippolytus does not indicate as much. He probably made a little capital of reputation out of this transaction. At all events he was classed with the Christians by Fuscianus, who sent him to work with others of the same faith in the unwholesome mines of Sardinia. Towards the close of the reign of Commodus, Marcia, the mistress of the emperor, who was a Christian (*οὐσα φιλόθεος*), wishing to do some act of piety, sent for Victor, then bishop of Rome, and inquired who were at that time martyrs in Sardinia. He furnished her with a list, omitting the name of Callistus. Marcia, having obtained her request from Commodus, sent a letter of release (*ἀπολυσίμην ἐπιστολὴν*) to Sardinia by the hands of Hya-

cinthus, an Eunuch and a presbyter of the Church*. Callistus, finding his own name left out, entreated with tears and supplications, that he might be included in the liberation; and Hyacinthus taking on himself the responsibility of the step, induced the governor of the island to send him back with the rest. Victor and Carpophorus were much displeased at his return; and the former sent him to a kind of banishment at Antium, and assigned him a monthly allowance for his support. But from this time his fortunes gradually brightened. Building on his credit as a sort of martyr, he mingled deeply in the theological disputes of the day, and acquired a strong hold over the mind of Zephyrinus, whom Hippolytus describes as an ignorant, illiterate, and avaricious man; so that when Zephyrinus became bishop of Rome, he recalled Callistus from Antium, and stationed him at the Cemetery, a situation which gave him much influence among the Christians. Where doctrines are concerned, we must take the statements of Hippolytus with caution, as he wrote with a strong bias; but the charge seems probable enough, that Callistus changed about from one system to another, as best suited his present interests, taking up at one time Sabellianism, and supporting at another the views of Noetus or Theodotus; till at last, when he ascended the episcopal throne on the death of Zephyrinus, he threw off all disguise, and set up a school of his own, in which the Noetian heresy is said to have been a copious ingredient; and though bishop of Rome, became the head of a sect which was called from him the Callistians. Into this school Hippolytus, who, it should be recollected, was intimately connected with an adverse and a severer section of the Church, accuses him of introducing very lax notions of morality—promising forgiveness of sins on too easy terms, and justifying it by the parable of the tares and the wheat—admitting among his clergy men who had been twice and even thrice married—and allowing ladies of rank most extraordinary

* We find provision made for the admission of such persons to offices in the Church, in one of the Apostolical Canons. No. 17, as restored by Bunsen, vol. iii. p. 152. Hyacinthus not improbably held, like Carpophorus, some office in the palace, where Marcia's influence would be favourable to the Christians. We find them in such situations as early as the time of Paul. (Philipp. iv. 22.) They were, no doubt, Greeks or Hellenistic Jews—freedmen, perhaps slaves.

freedoms without exclusion from the Church. By thus offering indiscriminate communion to all, he gathered a very large body of adherents in Rome. Making every allowance for prejudice and personal dislike in Hippolytus, this cannot be all calumny; and the revelations thus disclosed by a grave and catholic bishop respecting two successive popes, in what is usually considered the purest age of the Church, must surely raise a doubt in those who connect the exercise of the highest spiritual powers with the unbroken transmission of apostolical authority in the alleged successors of St. Peter*.

The work terminates with Hippolytus's own Confession of Faith, of which we must give a brief recital. His fundamental doctrine is the absolute unity of God, with whom nothing is co-eternal; who made the universe out of nothing (*τὰ ὄντα οὐκ ὄντα πρότερον*)—some things of one

* Among the side lights that we get into the interior life of this age of the Church at Rome, is a curious fragment of the "Little Labyrinth"—also, according to Routh and Bunsen, a work of Hippolytus—which has been preserved by Eusebius (H. E. v. 28), and published in the *Reliquiæ Sacræ* (tom. ii. p. 131). It is the picture of a Society of Unitarian Dissenters, gathered in Rome, and vehemently opposed by the Catholics, at the close of the second century. Our space will allow us to mention only one circumstance respecting them. They insisted on the primitive apostolicity of their creed, which, they declared, had prevailed in the church till the time of Victor. They were noted for their devotion to human science, and had persuaded one Natalius, a Confessor, to become their bishop or pastor, offering him a salary of 150 denarii a month. This will be variously estimated according to the supposed value of the denarius. Taking it at a shilling, Bunsen makes the sum 7*l.* 10*s.* per month, or 90*l.* a year; Routh, at 5*l.* a month, or 60*l.* a year. If we take the value of the later denarius, as given in Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities, at 7½*d.*, we get an annual income of between 55*l.* and 56*l.* per annum. According to every computation, the salary was considerably below 100*l.* a year; though, as the value of money was greater then than now, a higher figure would be required to represent its modern equivalent. That it was considered a handsome remuneration, may be inferred from the author of the work taunting Natalius with the love of "filthy lucre"—*τῇ πλείστοις ἀπολλούσῃ αἰσχροκερδίᾳ*. We may form some notion of the relative social position then occupied by the ministers of the Christian Church—those at least who were not admitted into communion with the Catholics—by comparing this salary with that which was paid by the State to the teachers of philosophy at Athens, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus. This, according to Schlosser (*Weltgeschichte*, vii. p. 133), was 10,000 drachmæ, or 2,400 gulden; which, if we reckon the gulden at 2*s.* 2*d.*, gives 280*l.* per annum. The remuneration of the Sophists appears to have increased with time. Eumenius, who was Professor of Rhetoric in the College of Autun under the emperors Maximian and Constantius, had a salary of 600,000 sesterces, which, according to Gibbon (vol. ii. p. 178, note, Milman's edit.), must have exceeded, at the lowest computation, 3,000*l.* a year. Schlosser reduces the sum to 1,500*l.* a year.

essence or element (*μονοοὐσία*), others of two, three, or four; the first sort are immortal, as not admitting of dissolution; for what we call death, is the solution of parts bound together (*ἡ τῶν δεδεμένων λύσις*).

There is one exception to this creation out of nothing, in the case of his indwelling Word or Thought (*λόγος*) which alone God produced immediately out of his own substance (*ἐξ ὄντων ἰγέννα*), or in the terminology of theologians, begat*. The Word thus issuing at once from God's own essence, through God's reflection on Himself, was the instrument by which he made and fashioned all things, the thought or idea which He expressed in them. His last work was Man, whom He set at the head of creation, having compounded him of all the elements. Him he did not desire to make a god or an angel, and failed of his object—but simply, man. 'Had He wished'—he continues—'to make thee God, He could have done so; thou hast an example in the Logos; but desiring a man, He made thee a man. Now if thou wishest to become God also, be obedient to thy Maker, and do not resist Him now, that being found faithful in a small matter, thou mayst be entrusted with what is great. The Word of God alone proceeds from God; wherefore it is also God, being the substance of God. But the world being made out of nothing, is therefore not God, but admits of dissolution when the Creator wills it.'

God is not the author of evil; but being himself good, could make nothing but what is beautiful and good. Evil is the result of the free will, with which God has endowed man; for no action is evil from the beginning, but becomes so through the wish and thought which makes it such. To a being thus free and rational, a divine law imparted by the Logos working in the minds of just men and prophets, is well adapted. But in the fulness of time the Logos himself was made manifest to the eyes of men—present and speaking to them. 'He took a body from a Virgin, and put on the old man through a new formation, passing

* The distinction should be noticed. In the creation out of nothing, the verb *ποιῶν* is used; in the generation of the Word out of the Divine substance, *γεννῶν*. The Nicene Creed preserves this distinction in English thus: *begotten, not made*.

through every period of life, that he might himself become a law to every period, and by his presence exhibit his own humanity (τὸν ἴδιον ἀνθρώπου) as an aim to all men, and thereby prove that God has made nothing evil; for man, as endowed with free will, is able to will and not to will, being able to do either. This incarnate Word we know to have been a man of our own composition (τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς φυράματος). Had he not, it would have been useless to order us to imitate our Teacher. For were that man of another substance, why should he bid one who was born weak, do like things, and how can he be good and just? But that he might be deemed no other than we, he endured toil, and was willing to hunger, and did not refuse to thirst, and reposed in sleep, and did not decline suffering, and was obedient unto death, and manifested his resurrection, offering up in all these things the first fruits of his own humanity; that thou, when thou sufferest, mayst not be disheartened, but confessing thyself a man, mayst expect thyself also what the Father granted to him.'

The Confession concludes, as we now have it, in the following terms:—'These things (the punishments of the impious) thou wilt escape, having been taught the doctrine of the living God, and thou wilt have a body immortal and imperishable together with the soul, and thou wilt receive the kingdom of heaven, having lived on earth and known the heavenly King, and thou wilt be a companion of God, and a fellow-heir of Christ, no more subject to desires and passions and sicknesses. For thou art become God (γέγονας θεός); for whatsoever sufferings thou hast endured, as being a man, these things God hath given thee, because thou art a man; and whatsoever things befit deity, God has promised to bestow, when thou hast become divine (θεοποιηθῇς), having been born into immortality through the knowledge of the God who hath made thee. This is the true meaning of *Know thyself*. For self knowledge falls to the lot of him who is called by God, through being known by Him (1 Cor. xiii. 13).—Be not at strife therefore with one another, O men, nor hesitate to run your course anew; for it is Christ whom the God of all hath ordered to wash away their sins out of mankind, making the old man new, having called him his image typically from the beginning, displaying his love towards thee;

whose solemn commandments if thou obeyest, and becomest a good imitator of the good, thou wilt be like him, and honoured by him. For God becomes a beggar for thy sake, having made thee God for his glory.*

We must now take leave of Hippolytus with simply remarking, that he was the first great preacher which the Roman Church produced, and helped to render current in it the ideas of the Greek theology; that he is said to have suffered martyrdom in the reign of Maximin the Thracian (235-238 A.D.); and that he enjoyed a traditional reputation for great amiableness of character, being described by a contemporary of Chrysostom, as *γλυκύτατος καὶ εὐνούστατος*.

In comparing M. Bunsen's disquisitions with the work of Hippolytus, we readily discover the points of interest and sympathy which have so strongly attracted him towards it. He perceives the wide diffusion of that Father's influence in developing the Christian liturgy and discipline. He tracks his footsteps in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions, and finds his name in the Abyssinian version of the same ecclesiastical code. He enters heartily into his protest against the scandalous proceedings of the bishops of Rome; rejoices at the evidence which his pages furnish of the early authority of our canonical books,

* We have rendered this last passage, like all the preceding, according to the emendations and transpositions of M. Bunsen, though we have not always adhered to his version. Here occurs in the original text, a startling sentence, the purport of which is altogether at variance with the strain of the whole Confession. It stands thus: *Χριστὸς—ἔστιν ὁ κατὰ πάντων Θεὸς*, 'Christ is God over all,'—the article showing, that the Supreme God the Father, must be meant. It is altered by M. Bunsen into *Χ. ἢ ὁ κατὰ πάντων Θεὸς*, etc., making the Supreme Father give the direction to Christ. He thinks the reading in the text rendered impossible by what Hippolytus has just said of the relation of God, the Creator, to the Logos. He adds, (I. p. 165) 'the corruption of the text may be accidental; but it may also be the consequence of a designed correction in *pejus*.' It will be noticed, that this Confession terminates rather abruptly. M. Bunsen supposes he has found the wanting conclusion in the second part of the 'Epistle to Diognetus,' which is known to bear strong internal marks of being by a different hand from the first. Does it bear a greater similitude to this work of Hippolytus? It is with great diffidence that we venture on an opinion in opposition to so critical a judgment as M. Bunsen's. But we cannot say, that we feel the resemblance which he affirms. Both the style and the thought of the fragment in question seem to us less clear and scholar-like than those of Hippolytus. Identity of doctrine as to the Logos, is no conclusive proof of identity of authorship. Before the close of the second century, it was the acknowledged doctrine of a very large portion of the Church.

especially of John; and, above all, accepts with peculiar satisfaction his clear and philosophical enunciation of the doctrine of the Logos. There is therefore a closer and more spiritual connexion between the ancient and the modern author, than what arises from mere antiquarian or philological curiosity.—The English writer with great decision of purpose goes at once to the root and principle of all religion in the fundamental organization of the human mind, and endeavours to penetrate into the broad philosophic truth which underlies the dogmatic formulas of his Greek forerunner. In the spirit of Herder he contemplates all human history as the progressive unfolding of one great religious idea. Man's spirit is with him a reflex of the Divine. From meditating on the essential nature of all Spirit, he arrives at a conception of the nature of God. There is first, his primitive existence, his absolute being; then, his reflexion on himself as the Eternal Reason, possessed of intelligence and will, the archetype and ideal of man, the philosophic expression for which is the Logos or word (*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*); lastly, the consciousness of union between this reason outwardly manifested in the sum total of finite ^{intelligences} ~~existences~~ (*λόγος προφορικός*) with the Absolute Being himself. To this abstract ^{tyrant} ~~tyrant~~, viewing the world under its broadest aspect, he finds an equivalent expression in God, Man, Humanity—the idea of Humanity as a whole being something higher than that of Man as an individual; or taking the more limited view of the Christian Church, in the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He discovers ^{the} ~~the~~ ground, therefore, of a Trinity—not, it will be remarked, of an Athanasian, or even of a Nicene Trinity—in the highest metaphysics, in the very ultimates of human speculation. How strong are his convictions on this point, we gather from the following observation (I. p. 303): "I say with Meier, and with almost all German writers of note, that the doctrine of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and that without it Christianity, as a theological and as a philosophical system, cannot rank much above Rabbinism and Mohammedanism." We entirely agree with our author, that the sole conclusive evidence of a divine revelation, must be found in the interior perceptions, or intuitions, of the soul itself; and that

the notion of a merely historical revelation, supported by miracles (of which he has clearly shown, how the most religious minds may take a completely opposite view, II. p. 63), 'is as unhistorical as it is unintellectual and materialistic.' But we think he deceives himself, when he affirms, that the philosophical formula of the Trinity which we have just exhibited, was 'obtained by the purely philosophical analysis of the mind, without any mixture of evidence with speculation' (II. p. 49). It can hardly be doubted, that on all later inquiries into this mysterious subject, the views so distinctly put forth by the most philosophical of the Christian Fathers and by the later Platonists, must have had a strong influence; and that speculation in this as in so many other instances, has been unconsciously guided by history. This does not, however, strike us as in itself any valid objection to the views entertained by our author. It only shows, that, if true, they must be referred to that great general revelation which God is continually making from age to age through the progress and experience of the human spirit. Without the speculations engendered by Christianity, and the phenomena embodied in its history, we might ~~never~~ have attained to such a conception of the relations between God and Man; and minds that have been left unrestrained by Christian influences, may have struck out into a very different line of thought. But the only question of importance is this; does the conception when rightly apprehended and fairly proposed, carry a warrant of truth along with it, in its adaptation to the religious wants of the soul, and in its solving better than any other conception, the spiritual mystery of the universe?—For ourselves, we do not hesitate to say, that there is a Trinity, not that which is expressed in any ecclesiastical creed, but such as is implied in profound spiritual unity between God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit working in the hearts of just and devout men through all human history, which appears to us to result very clearly from the collective suggestions of the New Testament, and which we are prepared to accept as a fundamental truth of religion. The doctrine of the Logos more especially, expressed in the opening verses of John's gospel, as indicating the spiritual link between God and Man, and opening the way

by which humanity may become divine—we rejoice to acknowledge not only as the corner-stone of the whole Christian system, but as the very basis of a true religious philosophy. Nothing has been more disastrous in its effect on the devotional sensibility and the growth of sound theological doctrine, than the attempt to fix and define these great spiritual truths within human formularies; and the controversies which it has created, have proved almost as injurious to the opponents, as to the assertors, of the pretension. For the Trinity of the Schools is a dry and meagre abstraction, standing far aloof from the deepest intuitions of human consciousness, pregnant with no holy thoughts, no divine consolations; and seems by a sort of fatality, to strike with spiritual barrenness every religious community which has made it the central point of defence or attack. These are no new views of ours, suggested by the perusal of M. Bunsen's work. We have entertained them, and with a growing conviction, for years; and the only effect of knowing the opinions of one so learned and so wise has been to deepen and confirm them. We might have expressed our conception of the subject in a different way; but the idea which lies at the bottom of his exposition, we accept*.

It is necessary, however, that there should be a clear mutual understanding in this matter; and that terms should not be used in one sense by a writer, which are liable to be taken in another by the reader. To the doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos—in other words, of the manifestation of the Divine ^{Wisdom} ~~Person~~ in the perfect humanity of Jesus—we have already expressed our cordial adherence; but the most entire adoption of this view,

* Long before the appearance of 'Hippolytus and his Age,' on a very different occasion we wrote thus: "Though few additions to primitive Christianity have created more discord, and raised more scruples and doubts in honest minds, than the presumptuous attempts of Councils to define the unsearchable, and the authoritative assertion of contradictions in the so-called Athanasian Creed—yet there is a sense, a broad, simple, scriptural sense, in which every Christian must admit an union and harmony and mutual relation between the offices of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the joint work of human creation, redemption and sanctification—in the powers which we originally received, the motives by which we are religiously acted on, and the secret aids that strengthen and comfort our souls—which makes the world we live in, the Scripture we read, and the Church that nurtures us, one vast, consistent and progressive process of moral and spiritual discipline."

which is to us simply the acceptance of a historical fact embodying the deepest truth of religious philosophy—is consistent with the retention and the rejection of many other points of belief, which in the existing state of theological opinion, are understood to involve the question of orthodoxy or heresy.—Now we do not find on examination, that on several of these points the Chevalier Bunsen is a whit more orthodox than ourselves.—He holds with Hippolytus, and as we hold, that there is a divine element in the human soul, through the development of which the individual may become in eternity *θεός*, or as the author of the 2nd epistle of Peter has declared of a true Christian even in the present life, *θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως*; and he thinks that ‘the difference between Christ and the other men of God is analogous to that between the manifestation of a part, and of the totality and substance, of the divine mind;’—that ‘in other words, the Christian religion is a manifestation of the very centre of God’s substance, which is Love.’* He has put his ideas on this subject in his Philosophical Aphorisms. ‘In every human soul,’ he says, ‘there are two factors; the infinite, as far as the soul is a part of the self-consciousness of God before all finite existence; and the finite, as far as man has the immediate or nearest cause of his existence in another created being, or (in the first instance) in the agency of an elementary power in earth.’—‘The infinite factor is the enigma of every man’s existence. It is incalculable and inexplicable.’—‘The greatest difference between individuals is therefore in the infinite factor. Although, theoretically, only a difference in degree, it can amount, practically, to a difference in kind.’† We think this extract very clearly reveals the author’s view of the person of Jesus Christ. It contains nothing to which we do not give our ready assent; but it falls, we apprehend, very far below the standard of orthodoxy. He has more than once expressed the thought, that the first tendency to the scholastic exaggeration of Christian doctrine originated in the attempt

* II. p. 64. Justin Martyr has said the same thing, and made the identical distinction between *τὸν πάντα λόγον* and *σπειρματικὸν λόγον μέρος*. He speaks also of *ἑμφορὴν παντὶ γίνεσθαι ἀνθρώπων στίγμα τοῦ λόγου* (Apol. II. 8.), which is M. Bunsen’s infinite factor of humanity.

† II. p. 36.

to effect an union between the historical Christ of the Church and the ideal Christ of the Philosophers. This he considers to have been the aim of Hippolytus, in opposition to the Theodotians, ~~at~~ ⁱⁿ Rome, where the old popular monarchianism, based on little learning, and still less speculation, had till that time prevailed*. What is his real opinion, seems to us left in no doubt by the words which he has put into the mouth of Hippolytus in his imaginary Apology:—"It appears to me strange, that the word (in the Nicene Creed) should have so merged in the Son, that it has certainly disappeared. This I must consider rather a departure from Scripture; and I cannot help thinking, that it has led to an unphilosophical identification, not in substance but in form, of the divinity and humanity of Christ, or the Logos and the historical Christ. The speculative mind will always have a great reluctance to identify one with the other so entirely without distinction, as to merge the eternal idea entirely in its temporal manifestation†?" We gather even from his language in another passage, that he does not attach any vital importance to the belief of the miraculous introduction of Jesus into the world. 'The belief in Incarnation,' he observes in the concluding section of his Philosophical Aphorisms, 'is the full acknowledgment of the Hellenic idea of heroic dignity, divested of the fetters of physical necessity and fable. The Christian idea of incarnation appears in St. John and in St. Paul, entirely independent of any præternatural procreation. The philosophical, or infinite factor, is the principal, and may be the original.'

If we rightly interpret these various passages, the doctrine of M. Bunsen respecting the Word, or Son, or in the unscriptural language of theologians, the second person of the Trinity, amounts to this: that in the sinless humanity of Jesus the Divine Wisdom or Reason which is essential Love, was perfectly manifested—holding up to men through this harmonious union of the Divine and Human the ideal of their nature, and by its powerful attraction on their affections and their wills assimilating their own souls more and more with the Divinity manifested in Christ; that Christ's own words express his consciousness of the Divine within him; and that this revelation of

* I. p. 305.

† IV. p. 52.

God in Man, is not the less complete, because man may have come into the world in the ordinary way, but depends on the full expression of the infinite factor which enters into his compound being.—We accept this as the highest truth. We think we see it reflected in what are often considered the most mysterious passages in the gospel of John; and as in its philosophical aspect, we recognize it as the solid basis of faith and worship, so contemplated as a historical fact, we find in it the true interpretation of Providence and a key to the spiritual mission and destiny of mankind. The Universe is a manifestation of the Logos—an utterance in outward operation of that Infinite Mind, in the image of which Man was made, and of which his own Nature is the finite reflection. To sympathize and work with this Divine Reason is the glory and blessedness of man. We have a concentrated expression of it, within the limits of humanity, and in its moral and spiritual relation to our race—in the person of Jesus Christ—the incarnate Word; that through that Divine life and its wide attraction for men's souls, universal humanity may be gathered into one, and be directly and visibly united with the primal Intelligence and Parent Mind of the Universe.—Here we have a rich and nourishing truth. But it is easy to see, how the philosophic formula of the production of the Word out of the Divine Substance, and the historical fact of its taking flesh among men, when their mutual relation and possible union came to be dwelt on, might lead in an arid and dogmatizing age, to unfruitful speculations on the coexistence of two natures in one person. We already discern a tendency towards this issue in the work of Hippolytus; and the same has driven Christians in more advanced times, to a one-sided conception of the truth recorded in the Gospel, as they have been more attracted by the divine or by the human element in Christ's life. The rationalists have taken their stand on the three first gospels, and from that point of view have exclusively interpreted his entire history; while those of a mystical cast of thought have allowed all their sympathies to be absorbed by the spiritual and the divine so fully disclosed by John. The true balance of faith is found in a combination of both views. The synoptical evangelists exhibit with beautiful simplicity and artlessness, the

human elements which lie at the basis of the life of Jesus. The fourth displays the higher view which rose upon the meditative mind, when his life and his death and all the consequences of them to the world, were contemplated in their totality from afar. The exclusion of the last view leaves a meagre Ebionitism as its result. Where the other is wanting, all historical faith dissolves into a bodiless Docetism. These heresies have not been limited to the old Church. We see them reproduced in the modern extremes of a hard humanitarianism and a fanatical orthodoxy. There is great truth in these words of M. Bunsen:—

“The consciousness of Christ of himself and his expressions about it (in chapters ii. viii. and xiv. of the gospel of St. John) form the divine and historical groundwork for the metaphysical exposition contained in the words of the prologue. This is the indestructible basis, inaccessible to any doubts of historical criticism, of the Christian doctrine of the Son, and of the whole second article of our faith. His life and death of self-devotion for mankind as his brethren, and as children of God, form the historical seal of that grand revelation.” *

It will be seen from the foregoing quotations, that our author builds his view of Christian doctrine mainly on the Gospel of John; and one cause of his deep interest in the work of Hippolytus, is his firm persuasion of the evidence which it furnishes of the authenticity and early recognition of that gospel. His opinions respecting the fourth Evangelist are strongly opposed to the recent conclusions of the Tübingen school of theology, at present represented by Baur. With their writings on this subject we are not acquainted; but on looking some years ago into the controversy respecting John's Gospel, first raised by the late Dr. Bretschneider, we brought from it a decided impression that the advocates of the negative side of the question had not made out their case. Our prepossessions therefore are in favour of the authenticity of this gospel. Moreover we value and love it greatly, and wish to think that we possess in it the genuine utterance of an apostolic mind. Nevertheless, we cannot say, that we find M. Bunsen's reasoning in the work before us perfectly con-

* II. p. 114.

clusive. His argument is, that in the records of very early Gnostic sects described in the book 'On Heresies,' we not only trace the influence of John's ideas, but find his gospel cited in the very words. He takes the Ophites as an example, whom he infers from a supposed allusion to them in 1 Tim. i. 4, to have been in existence before the close of the life of Paul. As they quote John, his gospel must have been written when they published their doctrines; and this will carry us back into the first century for its production. But in the first place, admitting the authenticity of the first Epistle to Timothy, which was questioned by Schleiermacher, we can discover no trace of any Ophite doctrines in the passage referred to. Secondly, there is every reason to believe, that the Ophites existed as a sect—perhaps among the Jews*—before the preaching of Christianity, and exhibited one of the many forms of Jewish and heathen error which subsequently intermingled themselves with it†. But this early existence as a sect does not involve their early acquaintance with Christianity; and far more time must have been required for such an amalgamation of Christian ideas with heathen fables as the Ophite system represented by Hippolytus involves, than could have been brought within the limits of the apostolic age. Lastly, these sects underwent a continual development, the periods of which are not distinctly marked by Hippolytus; so that when he alleges their citations from the Gospel of John, we have no means of determining except by the inherent probabilities of the case, whether he is referring to works produced in the earlier or later stages of their existence. In the Simonians who are described next after the Ophites by Hippolytus, mention is constantly made of a work called ἡ Ἀποφάσις, in which their doctrines are contained, and which, though bearing Simon's name, M. Bunsen himself admits was not written by him, but by his disciples, and therefore represents his system as it existed after his time. The same remark, it seems to us, may be applied to the cita-

* Mosheim (quoted by Gieseler, § 44, n. k.), in his 'Geschichte der Schlangen brüder,' pp. 19 and 127, inferred this from a passage in Origen's work against Celsus, vi. § 28.

† Justin Martyr alludes to the wide diffusion of serpent worship in the ancient world. Apol. i. 27.

tions from John's Gospel in Hippolytus's account of the Basilidians, on which, ^{as} ~~the~~ dating from the time of Basilides himself in the first half of the second century, M. Bunsen lays so much stress in support of his cherished conclusion. But as the sect subsisted long after the time of Hippolytus, we cannot decide whether the quotations are taken from the works of Basilides or from those of his disciples. The use of the singular *φησιν* proves nothing, for it is only a loose mode of continuous citation. Indeed in one of the two passages referred to by M. Bunsen, there appears, if we interpret it aright, to be a distinct allusion rather to the Basilidians than to Basilides*. Without, therefore, having ourselves any reasonable ground of doubt as to the authenticity of the fourth gospel, we do not think the inferences of our author from the work 'On the Heresies,' very well calculated to strengthen his view of the question. The knowledge and influence of this gospel would probably for some time be confined chiefly to Asia Minor, where constant tradition declares it was written. Perhaps it might first be brought into the West by Irenæus, the master of Hippolytus. Unless the assertion of the Theodotians, respecting the prevalence of their Monarchian faith in Rome before the time of Victor, be wholly without foundation—and we do not see what could induce them to make an assertion in the face of the whole church, which the whole church could easily disprove—the doctrine of the Logos, as taught by John, could not very long before the close of the century have acquired any great ascendancy in Rome. The unlearned Christians assembled there still tarried in the elements of the Gospel. The reaction against Gnosticism and the efforts of ~~the~~ learned men like Irenæus and Hippolytus, must have been among the earliest influences that would lead to a fuller development of the central idea of Christianity. What seems tolerably certain is, that at the opening of the third cen-

* P. 232. Τοῦτό ἐστιν ὃ λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι.—The name Basilides occurs a few lines before, but rather as the representative of a system than the author of a book.—It is worthy of remark, that in this work of Hippolytus, as in Justin Martyr, the Gospels are quoted without mentioning the names of the particular Evangelists. The name even of John, so far as we have noticed, occurs only once (p. 256), and then as the author of the Apocalypse. When his gospel is cited (as in p. 232), it is introduced by the general formula, Τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς Εὐαγγελίοις.

tury, this idea, partly it may be presumed through the teaching of Hippolytus, had struck a ~~deep~~^{deep} root in the West, superseding on one hand the Jewish or Ebionitish view, and by its distinct assertion of Christ's complete humanity, excluding every form of Gnosticism on the other.

In the richly-cultivated mind of M. Bunsen, at once philosophical and learned, two principles seem always contending for the mastery;—his clear apprehension of the eternal idea of Christianity as a truth founded in the spiritual nature of man, and his scholar-like reverence for the antique formula in which that idea has more or less perfectly stamped itself.—If we do not misapprehend his meaning, he regards nothing essential in Christianity, but the trustful sacrifice of the individual self-will to the will of God, in profound sympathy with the spirit of the Divine Word manifested in Christ; and this its essential life he seems to admit, may coexist with very different dogmatic conceptions of spiritual realities, and may express itself earnestly through very different outward modes of worship. He will not allow, for example, that even the Apostolic Church contains an absolute rule for us, referring its authority to its 'agreement in all essential points with that which philosophical and historical criticism of Christianity must call the truth' (II. p. 111). Scripture itself he considers to have been made canonical by the church, and to be inspired so far only as it is a genuine product of the living Christian consciousness (II. pp. 148, 9). He protests most earnestly—and, as we think, with entire justice—against the confusion and identification, so common in our modern theological schools, of the history of the Word of God with the Word of God itself. 'By this mistake,' he says with equal boldness and truth, 'the faith in the real Word of God, which is the only immutable and eternal standard of truth, and has its response in the Spirit within, was obscured, and is obscured to this day; and its only recipients Reason and Conscience, have been and are violated, to the sad confusion of Christ's Church'.*—How this doctrine so clearly and emphatically laid down, must affect his views of inspiration and revelation and their authoritative demands on human reason, it is needless to point out. All

* II. p. 150.

vital Christian truth lies *within* the mind of the believer, in living contact with his convictions and his sympathies. Whatever is *outward* in form or doctrine, whatever is the result of simple logic, belongs to its historical development and not to its essence. But if this be M. Bunsen's theory of Christianity—and we presume it is—why should he be so anxious to allege an exact—not merely scriptural—but even ecclesiastical—precedent for any views which his own religious nature tells him are and must be just? Why should he attach more weight to the words of Irenæus and Hippolytus, however wise and pious according to the measure of their age, than to the enlightened dictates of his own Christian spirit?—This mixed feeling has blinded him, we think, in a few cases to a thoroughly impartial reading of the monuments of antiquity. He carries his own vivid conceptions and benevolent feelings with him into the inquiry, and finds them reflected back upon him from the pages which he is interpreting. For instance, his view of the Christian sacrifice symbolised in the Eucharist—that it is the offering of the worshipper's self-will in trust and gratitude and humility on the spiritual altar of God—expresses to us a great truth beautifully conceived.—We should rejoice to see it made more prominently than it is, the central thought and feeling of our public devotions. On an enlarged view of human history, we see no objection to his statement, that there are, and have been, only two real sacrifices in the world—that of the historical Christ 'offered up through a life of holiest action and a death of purest love,' and that of the Church which perpetuates his spirit from age to age (IV. p. 91). And further we agree with him, that all those views of the Eucharistic rite have lost the true meaning of it, and disjoined it from the living spirit of Christianity, which attach its spiritual efficacy, in whatever sense, to the material elements of bread and wine, and not to the affections of the participant; the real presence being in the mind of the worshipper, and the true transubstantiation being that of self into God*.

But we profess ourselves unable to find any very clear and definite resemblance to his own high and spiritual views on this subject, in the expressions concerning the

* IV. p. 96.

Eucharist, which occur even in the earliest Christian writers. We can discover no sure proof of that change or *metastasis*, as he calls it, in the central idea of the rite, which becomes apparent, as he affirms, on comparing the first notices of it with the later form which it assumed. So far as we have been able to follow the growth of the idea, even from the evidence which he himself has collected, we can trace nothing but regular, continuous development, aided by a deepening mysticism and the advance of the Sacerdotal spirit. If we once surrender ourselves to the principle of development as normal and authoritative, it is impossible to stop; we must abide by it till its last and most repulsive result. There is no deliverance, that we can see, for a true and vital Christianity, but the unqualified assertion of the prerogative of the Spirit over all historical forms whatever, and of the full right of the individual at every moment to appeal to his own conscience, and to determine from that what must, for him at least, be the truth of God.

When our Lord at the Last Supper, said to his disciples, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' his personal presence sufficiently prevented the possibility of their supposing any miraculous change at that time in the bread and the wine. Moreover the use of them was specially enjoined as a memorial. But when John wrote, half a century later, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day;'^{*}—in whatever sense these words may have been originally spoken and written, it is clear, that they were open to very ready misapprehension among a people who clung in their low mental state, to carnal conceptions of spiritual relations, and who, when further advanced they rose out of these, were apt to lose themselves in a cloud of mysticism. As the resurrection of Jesus in a body that could be 'seen with the eyes, and looked upon, and handled with the hands,' was necessary to give them in this state of advancement, a vivid apprehension of the life after death; so the great Christian doctrine of the dependence of human salvation on union—i. e. spiritual, mental, moral

^{*} John vi. 53, 54.

sympathy—with the Divine Word manifested in Christ, when conjoined with the mysterious language which Jesus had uttered at the farewell meal, and which had been repeated in a form more startling still by the beloved disciple—was unavoidably liable, in such times as followed the earliest propagation of Christianity, to the perverse interpretation, that some outward union with the glorified Christ, some direct material participation of his real, though mystical, body and blood—was indispensable to a thorough and secure enjoyment of the eternal life revealed by him. In reply to this view, it is not sufficient to allege, that general expressions respecting sacrifice occur in Christian writers, which admit of none but a spiritual interpretation, for the same may be affirmed of heathen poets*: but what has to be considered is this, whether when the bread and wine are distinctly alluded to by the earliest Catholic authorities down to Augustine, words are not used which convey an idea, vague it may be, but still unquestionable, of some change being wrought in them, whereby those elements affect beneficially the spiritual condition of the participant. 'We do not,' says Justin Martyr†, 'take these things as common bread or common drink, but in the same way as our Saviour Jesus Christ having been made flesh by God's word, assumed both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught, that the nourishment for which thanks are given in words prescribed by him, and by which through a change our blood and flesh are nourished, is both the flesh and the blood of that same Jesus who was made flesh.' Irenæus (B. IV. p. 327, quoted by Bunsen) employs language very similar. 'As the bread of earth, when the words of invocation are pronounced over it, is no longer common bread, but

* A beautiful example is furnished by M. Bunsen from Irenæus (II. p. 264), "Conscientia ejus qui offert, sanctificat sacrificium, *pura* existens." And again (ibid. p. 265), "Non his indigens (scil. Deus) attamen a nobis, propter nos fieri vult, ne simus infructuosi."

† Apolog. I. 66. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὅν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχηκε, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχαρίης λόγον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεὶς τρεφὴν ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σὰρκις κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν ἐκίνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἰδιδασθῆναι εἶναι. Is not the idea here expressed this, that both Jesus Christ, and his visible representation in the bread and the wine, are converted into flesh and blood by the same instrumentality of a divine word?

eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthy and a heavenly; so our bodies also partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible (*φθαρτὰ*) but possess the hope of a resurrection into eternity.* Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nyssa, quoted by Grabe, apply the same terms to the Eucharistic elements and to the Chrism and water of baptism. After the invocation of the Holy Spirit (*μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*) they are no longer common (*κοινὰ, λιτὰ, ψιλὰ*) but have acquired a divine quality and efficacy, and take the name of Christ. In the Pfaffian fragment of Irenæus, after the observation that 'the offering of the Eucharist is not fleshly, but spiritual and therein pure,' follow these words; 'having completed the offering, we invoke the Holy Spirit, to set forth the true character of this sacrifice—the bread as the body, and the cup as the blood of Christ,—that they who partake of these antitypes, may obtain the remission of sins and everlasting life.'† The epistles which bear the name of Ignatius, are no evidence, we admit, of the opinions of the second century, but they may be cited, at least in their smaller form, in illustration of prevailing belief before the time of Eusebius, at the commencement of the fourth century.—In the epistle to the Ephesians (c. xx.) the Eucharistic bread is called the 'medicine of immortality' (*φάρμακον ἀθανασίας*) and an 'antidote against death' (*ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν*); and in that to the Smyrnæans (c. vii.) heretics who reject the Eucharist, as denying it to be the body of Christ, are thereby said to incur death.—Augustine's argument, that it was necessary for children to be admitted to communion, as otherwise (referring to John vi. 53) they could not have eternal life, seems to show into what form the doctrine of the Eucharist had already developed itself in that portion of the Church with which he was connected‡. In the sacramental liturgy of the Church of Constantinople which M. Bunsen declares to express strongly and clearly the idea of the spiritual self-sacrifice of the Congregation, as the culminating point of the service, we

* The original words are given in Bunsen, II. p. 265.

† The original in Bunsen, II. p. 269.

‡ Bunsen, IV. p. 181.

find among the prayers, which we understand him to include in the real sacrificial act, the following:—

“We offer Thee this reasonable and bloodless service, and call on Thee, and supplicate and entreat: send down Thy Holy Ghost upon us, and on these gifts which are spread before us, and (breaking the bread) make this bread into the precious Body of thy Christ, changing it through Thy Holy Spirit: Amen. And what is in the cup into the precious Blood of Thy Christ, changing it through Thy Holy Spirit: Amen. And that they may become to those who partake of them a cleansing of the Soul, a forgiveness of Sins, a communion of the Holy Spirit, a fulfilment of Thy Kingdom, a joyful confidence towards Thee, a judgment not a condemnation.” *

If we do not wholly misapprehend the purport of the foregoing citations—and they are nearly all such as M. Bunsen himself has furnished us with—they indicate that with that act which our author represents as the central point of the Christian service—the Communion—there was associated in the early Church the belief in a mysterious efficacy operating through the elements on the condition of the communicant, and distinct from the inward, spiritual act of self-dedication to God—which it is impossible from our higher point of view to consider otherwise than superstitious. It is true, that these feelings at first differed very considerably in their object from those which subsequently attached to the idea of transubstantiation; but in both cases they seem to have involved a belief in some outward operation on the spiritual relations of the worshipper, and arose—

* Bunsen, IV. p. 191. We may sometimes detect the real character of opinions—the central idea out of which they spring—from their grosser exaggerations. We can hardly conceive, for example, that the Marcosians would have ventured to introduce their impious juggleries at the celebration of the Eucharist, if there had not been already in that age a widely-diffused belief that some supernatural change was actually wrought in the elements. Marcus, we are told by Hippolytus (*Hæres. Refutat.*, p. 200), who says he had himself exposed the trick, was accustomed to introduce secretly some colouring matter into the cup, and after pronouncing a long invocation over it, contrived to make the liquor appear at one time purple like wine, and to give it at another the red appearance of blood. On other occasions he poured the liquor out of a smaller into a larger cup, and made the latter run over, uttering at the same time a blasphemous formula. The bystanders thought they witnessed a miracle, and were very eager to drink of the divinely-consecrated cup: *ὡς δαῖτόν τι καὶ διὰ μεμελιστημένων φρέσσοντες ἄμα καὶ σπειρόντες ἕσπινον.*

perhaps inevitably—from an interfusion of the notions of a Jewish memorial-supper and of a heathen sacrifice, determined towards a particular result by the remarkable words of the gospel in which the institution had its origin. It is also true, that on each side of the proper communion—preceding it and following it—we meet with prayers of the most beautiful spiritual earnestness, exhibiting glimpses at least of the brightest revelation of the true idea of Christian self-sacrifice. But in this as in so many other points, in the history of the church, we witness a struggle between higher and lower elements for ascendancy—between the spirit of God always working with more or less power in the human heart, and the dark, carnal thoughts, the gross cravings ~~often~~^{after} material satisfaction, which so often closed around it and stifled its voice and broke its power.—Still the spirit was there, and the recognition of its presence justified every one who truly felt it, in adopting it as the only essential element of the service, and transforming under its influence into harmony with itself, those usages which originally expressed a lower idea and a feeling less pure. This would be perfectly consistent with our author's own doctrine*, 'that it is not possible, from the nature of things, that the most perfect form of the ancient church should be maintained *unchanged*.' It is the very idea which he has worked out so successfully in his defence of Infant Baptism, admitting at the same time that it was not the practice of the most ancient church, and that its introduction was encouraged at least by feelings allied to the carnal and the superstitious. Yet this retention of an old practice with a new idea, when followed by its needful complement in the rite of Confirmation, he demonstrates very clearly, may become one of the most expressive and valuable ordinances of the Christian Church. As the subject presents itself to us, we cannot but regret that M. Bunsen did not take this broader and more independent view in relation to the very important doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice, instead of labouring to establish it by a line of argumentation which does not carry full conviction to the mind. The doctrine itself, in its direct growth out of the living root of the Christian Spirit, is unassailable; the historical

* II. p. 162.

proofs by which it is endeavoured to be shown, that it has a hereditary claim on the acceptance of the church, are not so. It always gives us pain to see a great truth placed on what we believe to be an insecure foundation.

We have occupied much space, and yet feel that we have rendered no adequate justice to this most interesting and instructive work. On the subjects of prayer, psalmody, church discipline and church architecture, M. Bunsen has some very fine remarks dictated by a rare union of Christian piety and scholarlike taste and cultivation, which will well repay the reader's perusal. We must also particularly commend to his attention the Philosophical Aphorisms at the commencement of the second volume, and the admirable preface to the third. The latter every Englishman of liberal and earnest mind will at once appreciate. In the former some allowance must be made for German modes of thought and the peculiar terminology in which they are wont to clothe themselves. Any one, however, who will not be repelled by a first aspect of difficulty, but will take the trouble to penetrate to the fundamental and informing idea of the whole series, will find himself richly rewarded for his pains. We believe that there are here collected together in a somewhat loose and disjointed form, richer and ampler materials towards a true psychology of religion, and towards a satisfactory solution of many of those problems which still exercise devout and thoughtful minds, than have yet been made accessible to the English reader. On the wide field of his researches into the ancient liturgies and old law-books of the Christians, we have left ourselves no time to enter. Indeed the subject is too vast and too important to be treated of in a paragraph or two, and deserves an entire article to itself. We may possibly recur to it on some future occasion. We will merely observe in passing, that M. Bunsen has brought out very clearly, as one result of his investigation, that the further we can trace back the primitive liturgies, the simpler they become in doctrine and in form, and that in their oldest state they seem to have been little more than a general framework or directory for regulating the order of the service, in which ample space was left for the free utterance of spontaneous devotion. The oldest Christianity, as is evident from M. Bunsen's restoration of its Church and

House Book, was more a life than a doctrine, more an inward spirit than an outward form.—Instruction of the ignorant and the young, care of the sick and the poor, wise and faithful oversight of moral conduct, and brotherly communion between the members of the Church—were its principal and its vital elements.

In his theory of Church Government, our author lays down the broad and fundamental principle—as the only security for religious freedom and religious progress—that the source and centre of all ecclesiastical authority lie in the congregation; that the congregation rightly constituted, is from age to age the organ of the Spirit of God.—With this indispensable reservation of a first principle, M. Bunsen is not unfriendly to the general organization of the Church of England. He would maintain an episcopacy, something like that which was once advocated by Usher and Baxter, associated with ecclesiastical assemblies in which laymen and ministers should have equal influence, and based on the unassailable rights of a Christian people. After close reflection on this subject for many years, and with early belief and predilection pointing quite in an opposite direction, we had come independently to the same conclusion which is adopted by our author, that a thorough reform and liberal expansion of the Church of England, through increased vitality and earnestness among its own members, would under present circumstances be the happiest event that could happen to the religious life of our country—more conducive in all its consequences and opportunities to the mental and spiritual development of the national mind, than any further multiplication of the forms of mere Dissent as such. We inherit from our ancestors an immense machinery, capable of the widest action on the moral condition of the community, interlaced at every point with our civil and municipal institutions, and blended still more deeply with the habits and associations of the people.—We cannot afford to break it to pieces and scatter it to the winds, and trust to what accident or fanaticism may build up on its ruins.—But if renovation rather than destruction is ever to take place, the change must make full provision for honesty and earnestness; it must be large, liberal, and comprehensive; it must distinguish between the spirit and the forms of Chris-

tianity ; it must secure the rights of the people and the freedom of their teachers ; and insist on nothing fundamental beyond the recognition of Christianity as a divine element in our existing civilization. Were such a change within view as attainable, we believe that the great majority of religious men would gladly accept it. Even if religious scruples should still exclude themselves from its provisions, they would rejoice in so vast an increase of the means of the highest moral and religious influence.

We hail the appearance of the Chevalier Bunsen's book at the present time with peculiar satisfaction. His position in society, his intimacy with the most distinguished men of his day, his great learning, and the deep reverential conservatism which he mingles so naturally and yet so perceptibly with the free speech and bold conclusions of the scholar and the philosopher, will procure for his writings on the most important themes which can engage the thoughts of men, a respectful attention and a weight of influence which a production even of equal merit proceeding from a less distinguished personage, could not expect to enjoy. We hope and we believe, it will produce good effect on our Church and on our Universities—on the number of earnest, thoughtful, religious minds which many circumstances indicate to be increasing in the highest ranks. He has himself expressed the wish, that his work should rather create the conditions and furnish the materials of gradual and future, than form an incentive to hasty and present, change. In that wish we ourselves unite ; but believing that wise and timely reform is the true conservatism, we cannot but also desire, that what has been said so truly and so honestly, should become something more than a topic of conversation or even of controversy, that it should also direct earnest minds to practical questions and quicken all the energies of a religious patriotism.

In reviewing this work, with its wide range of thought and its great wealth of erudition, we have so constantly felt ourselves in the presence of a superior, that it is with real diffidence we have ventured on a few points to raise objections and avow dissent. Possibly we may have misunderstood M. Bunsen ; possibly more knowledge might have led us to see the complete justness of his views ; but

coming from such evidence as lay before us, to a different conclusion, we could not honestly have done our duty without stating it. With the general results, with the fundamental doctrines, with the leading ideas, with the pervading spirit of this admirable book, we desire once more to express our entire and grateful concurrence. We have said enough of ourselves. We will conclude in the noble words of M. Bunsen (III. p. 367):—

“And now one retrospective glance over our picture! The hidden germs of life have been developed into a new world, now growing into colossal proportions, and conscious of the awful alternative of death or regeneration. The great work of Christianity is not a hierarchy with her rich rituals and her ritualistic art and conventional science; its miracle is the world in which we live. It is the individual, standing before his God with his Bible and his self-responsible conscience, whether men or women, laymen or clerk. It is the Christian household founded on mutual trust. It is the congregation with its own shepherd and his pattern household. It is the Christian Municipality, governing itself by the self-government and mutual confidence which are in its members. It is the Christian Nation and State with her National Schools based upon the Gospel of the persecuted Church; with her universities expanding in the Christian philosophy founded by the martyrs; with her national hospitals grown out of the nurseries of the old deaconesses; and with her Poor Law, consecrating Christian support as a national debt; finally, with her Sovereignty of law, and with her religious and civil liberty, advancing by reform and not by revolutions. Where that work and that faith in its divine power live, there is Apostolicity, and there is the future of the world.”